DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 277 **SP 013 795**

AUTHOR	Pipes, Lana, Ed.
TITLE	Perspectives on Graduate Programs in Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 79
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Role; Curriculum Development; Educational Finance; Educational Problems; Enrollment; Federal Legislation; *Futures (of Society); *Graduate Study; *Needs Assessment; *Program Effectiveness; Research Utilization; Social Change; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The goals and purposes to be served by graduate level professional preparation for educators are examined and redefined in these essays. The authors are experienced as administrators in schools, colleges, or departments of education. The current state of graduate programs in education in terms of the pressures, problems, dilemmas, and opportunities are considered, as well as directions and options for the future. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173277

PERSPECTIVES ON GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

PERSPECTIVES ON
GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

Richard J. Clark, Jr. -- Mario D. Fantini
Carl J. Dolce -- Dale Nitzschke -- Joseph Lamberti
Ira J. Gordon -- James M. Cooper -- Wilford A. Weber
Robert L. Erdman -- John D. Mulhern -- Frederick B. Bunt
Vito Perrone -- Daniel E. Griffiths

Introduction by
Kevin Ryan

Published by the

American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education

and the

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

April 1979

SP 013 795

The Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
is funded by the National Institute of Education,
in cooperation with the following associations:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Association of Teacher Educators
National Education Association

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

This material does not necessarily reflect the viewpoints of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). AACTE is printing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Clearinghouse or the National Institute of Education.

Library of Congress Number: 79-88244

Standard Book Number: 0-89333-016-7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

FOREWORD iv

INTRODUCTION 1

GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR TOMORROW 3
Richard J. Clark, Jr., and Mario D. Fantini

RECONCEPTUALIZING GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION 15
Carl J. Dolce

GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION:
SOME ISSUES, CONCERNS, AND CHALLENGES 23
Dale Nitzschke and Joseph Lamberti

WHEN IGNORANT ARMIES CLASH BY NIGHT 31
Ira J. Gordon

GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION: RESPONDING
TO THE NEEDS OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION 43
James M. Cooper and Wilford A. Weber

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION:
PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE 53
Robert L. Erdman

GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION:
IN CRISIS OR TRANSITION? 65
John D. Mulhern

THE PURVIEW OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION 75
Frederick B. Bunt

AN "UPBEAT" PERSPECTIVE ON
GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION 85
Vito Perrone

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE AND THE REFORM OF TEACHER EDUCATION 95
Daniel E. Griffiths

THE CONTEXT OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION 107
Kevin Ryan

CONTRIBUTORS 115

ABOUT ERIC 116

5

FOREWORD

The time has come for a reexamination of graduate programs in education. The pressures for change during recent years have blurred the traditional missions of those programs, and the present confusion and uncertainty will not be dispelled without a conscious effort to redefine the goals and purposes to be served by graduate-level professional preparation for educators.

The authors of these chapters all have experience as administrators in schools, colleges, or departments of education, and are well-qualified to undertake such a redefinition. The contributors were asked first to consider the current state of graduate programs in education in terms of the pressures, problems, dilemmas--and opportunities--facing their individual institutions, and then to project directions and options for the future. Readers of this document will find the diversity of perspectives intriguing, and the cumulative insights of these educational leaders illuminating.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education have cooperated in the preparation of this publication, for the purpose of stimulating thought and action in long-range planning for these vital programs. We acknowledge with gratitude the provocative contributions of all the authors and of Kevin Ryan, who prepared the introductory and concluding statements. We also express our sympathy at the tragic death of one of the authors, Ira J. Gordon; he will be missed.

Reader comments and reactions are welcomed. In addition, the Clearinghouse invites the submission of papers on the topic of graduate programs in education, for possible inclusion in ERIC. Documents accepted are indexed and abstracted, and are announced in Resources in Education, a monthly index available in libraries and resource centers across the country. With the authors' permission, such documents are made available in microfiche and/or xerographic copy to users of ERIC. In this manner, materials of generally limited distribution are given more widespread dissemination, and the information base for education continues to be strengthened.

Lana Pipes
Editor
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Teacher Education

February 1979

INTRODUCTION

For several decades the growth and development of teachers has been a topic of concern among educators. However, like many other important topics, it has not received sustained or systematic attention. As long as we have had classrooms, there has been a need for teachers to gain greater command of their teaching areas, to encounter new ideas, and to develop new skills and strategies of teaching. At the present time, the need for the further development of our teaching force is acute and the subject is one of increasing interest. Indeed, there has been a veritable explosion of books, reports, and monographs on what is often referred to as "the inservice problem." On the other hand, there has not been a great deal of recent reflection and writing on the university's role in the advanced training of teachers.

There are several reasons such a reexamination of graduate teacher education is particularly timely now. First, education is not a static field. Children change. Social priorities change. Knowledge changes, although perhaps not as much as many have asserted in recent years. And, also, teachers change. They too go through stages of development both as people and as professionals.

A second reason is that teachers are initially undertrained. I believe it is well-recognized that one cannot provide an adequate base for a lifetime of professional practice in the short time available during the undergraduate years. The fact of the matter is that for a secondary school teacher we demand only about 80 percent of one year for all professional education, including student teaching. The figure is somewhat higher for an elementary school teacher, but the training often falls far short of what is needed. So the teacher goes into service with a very inadequate basic training.

Third, as a result of the undergraduate enrollment shrinkage experienced by schools of education, universities appear to be free to shift some of their human resources to graduate teacher education. Whether this is fact or fancy remains to be determined. Those who would use the argument should first analyze the comparatively high pupil/professor ratio which has characterized undergraduate teacher education programs. Second, they should examine their programs in light of the fact that the clinical training that has been urged and, to some degree, practiced in undergraduate teacher education programs in recent years is much more labor-intensive than the traditional approach. Still, however, there are institutions where the impetus to reassign faculty members to graduate teacher education, for whatever reason, is strong.

A fourth reason for reexamining our graduate programs for teachers is that the character of the teaching profession has changed. It is no longer a revolving-door profession. Because of the pill, the economy, the falling birth rate, and a host of other reasons, teachers are staying in the profession for longer and longer periods. The teacher dropout problem is a thing of the past. The need for providing sufficient support to these experienced professionals is more urgent.

A fifth reason, and one of a very different stripe, has to do with the question, "Who will do inservice?" At one level, this is a pragmatic and political question. But whether it is the universities or the colleges or the school systems or the professional associations of teachers or private consulting firms who actually do inservice training of teachers is a question of serious social significance. A good deal of money and power are on the line here. In the rapidly expanding educational environment of ten years ago there was plenty of work for everyone. However, the perception of many policy makers and public officials is that education today is an overbuilt industry.

The economic implications of the question, "Who will do inservice training?" are far-reaching. Certainly they are for that sector of the educational community that I know best--departments, schools, and colleges of education. In the sixties, higher education's education unit went through a massive buildup to respond to the call for what then seemed an ever-expanding need for teachers. Although there have been recent reports of a coming teacher shortage in the early 1980s, at the present the need has diminished dramatically and the colleges and schools of education are busily preparing themselves to respond to the training needs of teachers in service. If, through some redirection or altercations of some kind, schools and colleges are excluded from inservice training, the shock wave through higher education would be, in the short term, devastating. While not an economist or a political scientist, I believe that excluding higher education from the inservice education of teachers in the long run would have unhealthy effects on the entire educational enterprise in this country.

These, then, are five reasons that now is the likely moment for the reexamination of graduate teacher education. To aid in this reexamination, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education has invited a distinguished group of educators, many with scholarly interest in this area and extensive experience in graduate teacher education. It is our hope that these essays will not only encourage a fresh, new look at our graduate programs and the further study of this topic, but will prompt many to move to action, developing new and more powerful graduate programs for teachers.

KEVIN RYAN

The Ohio State University
February 1979

GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR TOMORROW

Richard J. Clark, Jr., and Mario D. Fantini

In the context of today's society, an educational system that is broad, coherent, and all-encompassing is needed to replace the outmoded system of schools that currently exists. Our present system is overloaded with agendas, confused about priorities, psychologically depressed, and only marginally effective. Graduate professional education, long preoccupied with schooling, now must shift its focus to the development of a new educational system.

This system will be involved in designing and implementing cognitive and affective, physical and social, formal and informal learning environments for people of all ages. Graduate education will necessarily tap a wider range of expertise than in the past, and will be involved with a broader spectrum of educational agencies than ever before. Consequently, it will also increasingly be caught up in events of the political and economic arenas.

In the following paragraphs we will first examine what we perceive as critical changes in the social and educational context in which programs for the education professions are designed. We will then discuss steps we are taking to increase the capacity of our one school to be more ready for the 1980s and beyond. With these steps we are cautiously optimistic that we can train the leaders whose commitments, knowledge, and skills can stem the rising tide of public and professional disillusionment about the capacity of social and educational institutions to perform their designated and ideal roles.

SOCIETAL AND EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

Graduate professional education had not been "invented" when many of today's senior citizens first started their formal schooling. The inventors were products of 19th century American schooling, characterized by Webster Spellers, McGuffey Readers, exalted history, moral lessons, rural contexts, the work ethic, domestic orientation, and manifest destiny. A catalog of societal changes since the turn of the century would be encyclopedic in quantity and obscuring in detail. Yet a few generic changes are critical in understanding major differences in the contexts in which our graduates will go to work.

The U.S. population has shifted from east to west, from agrarian to urban settings, and--subsequently and in part--from the cities to the suburbs. People live longer and work fewer hours, days, and years of their lives. At the same time the United States, once the source of unlimited land and resources, is now largely populated and conspicuously limited in natural resources. The OPEC cartel's ability to establish policies whose significant import to the American economy as a whole affects each and every individual signals clearly the validity of Buckminster Fuller's proposition that we live, interdependently, on Spaceship Earth.

The legislative and judicial branches of government have established beyond the doubt of public education's performance that equal opportunity--for young and old, rich and poor, gifted and handicapped, minority "type A" and minority "type B," men and women--should be more than rhetoric or tokenism. In addition, we have also witnessed the rise of collective bargaining, specialization, mass communication, urbanization, technology, and population mobility in recent decades. We are also living, for the first time, in a post-industrial society where more persons are employed providing services than producing goods.

Progress--and Disillusion

In the education realm, a greater proportion of people attend and complete high school and college than ever before. Despite the fact that SAT scores are lower than in almost two decades, more than half of today's high school graduates attend college. Older students are increasingly populating college classrooms. Education budgets are tighter and demands for accountability are greater. Policy, administrative, and curricular decisions at all levels are increasingly influenced or determined by state and national policies, and by negotiated contracts. A college degree is no longer a passport to employment. Mass television, accessible to virtually the entire population, has challenged formal education as the country's primary educational institution.

Both the public and professional educators are less enchanted with the performance and achievements of public schooling than at any time in recent history. Therefore, graduate programs in education are today at a crossroads which demands creative synthesis of elitist and populist norms to the end of recruiting, educating, and placing personnel who are at once expert and eclectic in designing and implementing effective educational systems. Just as the qualitative exhortations of the liberal arts advocates have been shown inadequate, so too have the pat panaceas of training-oriented behaviorists in effectively turning the tide of disillusionment with public education and its leadership.

In the context of these developments, a proliferation of alternative and compensatory educational agencies have been created or strengthened in recent years to accomplish what the mainstream institutions have failed to do--or have done poorly--and to meet new societal needs. Private schools, for positive and negative reasons, are enjoying an unprecedented boom. Alternative programs and schools, both public and private, are attracting attention and students by their appeal to a sense of community, humanistic values, and competency. Social agencies--drop out, drop in, teen, learning, drug, and counseling centers; homes for runaways, juvenile offenders, and pregnant teens--have been established to supplement or replace services historically offered or needed by schools. A proliferation of agencies, too, have emerged to provide social and educational services to traditionally non-school-age populations; these are characterized particularly by adult education, community education, and senior citizen centers and programs.

New Roles in Education

In education, most traditionally defined roles continue, and a host of new roles have appeared. Through federal programs such as Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers, school-based teacher educators have become key personnel. With the implementation nationally of Public Law 94-142, and in Massachusetts of Chapter 766, special education administrators, consultant teachers, and experts in individualizing the educational process are increasingly in demand. Court decisions stemming from the landmark

Brown vs. Board of Education decision in 1954, and subsequent school system policies, have generated a whole range of professional roles which--while not clearly labeled nor uniformly defined--are significantly different from those of the past.

Tightened education budgets and increased legislative, judicial, and union roles in educational decision making have led to a new set of skills and new knowledge, both currently in high demand in education circles at teaching and administrative levels. Social service agencies, publishers, business, and industry are simultaneously discovering and acting on their educational roles, with a resulting increased demand for education professionals within their ranks. Day care workers, television writers, and education directors in libraries, museums, and industrial sites are all now part of the education profession. On the international front, experts in community development, training, adult literacy, non-formal education, and college development are all participating in the education scene.

Within traditional, mainstream education, there continues to exist a reservoir of immense talent--coupled with a simultaneous sense of impotence or incompetence. A parallel phenomenon at all levels, especially the graduate, is what Janis has called "group think." A prevailing sense of smugness and invulnerability precludes attention to negative feedback and reinforces the belief that what is being done is right. As criticism grows, as aptitude and achievement test scores decline, and as urban education continues to flounder, the "group think" phenomenon increases, reasonably but detrimentally for all involved.

The preceding catalog of changing contexts and developing roles, while not exhaustive, is nonetheless clearly suggestive. The issue for all those involved in graduate professional education is to attempt to make sense of it all, and then to take some action. While we caution against the status quo implications of "group think," we also caution against a nongeneric over-response to particulars. The challenge is to sort out the fundamental changes from the transitory shifts, and then to orient our own institutional adjustments to the former.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR TODAY

In the remainder of this chapter we discuss steps that we at the University of Massachusetts School of Education are currently taking or seriously contemplating to make our own institution more responsive to the societal need for a comprehensive educational system. Much of what we discuss is for the purpose of "enabling," rather than defining and completing the agenda. In the process, we assume that graduate professional education should be concerned with preparing its graduates to provide leadership in defining, implementing, and nurturing all, or significant parts, of our educational system.

For clarity, we have organized our discussion into four broad and interrelated areas: power and control; curriculum; personnel; and fiscal/organizational concerns.

Power and Control

The graduate education of professional educators for the future must be designed in response to a vision of what education will be and a clear sensitivity to the needs, aspirations, and realities of the potential graduate student population of the coming decades. As we have suggested earlier (and will elaborate on when we discuss curriculum), graduate professional education will necessarily and appropriately move farther away from its historical roots in the arts and sciences. It will be less preoccupied with preparing professors and basic researchers (who will nonetheless continue to play a crucial role) and more concerned with education practitioners who can function in leadership roles in a broader array of settings. It will increasingly recruit experienced, working people whose economic demands require that they either continue to work or receive substantial funding during the period of graduate study.

To enable significant changes in curriculum and procedures, to encourage practice-oriented as well as traditional academic definitions of quality, and to allow graduate professional education to function as an equal and effective partner with external agencies, schools of education across the country must have increased decision-making authority within their own institutions. In our own experience, the significant, positive progress made in opening channels of communication and shared decision making between schools, colleges, or departments of education and professionals in the field has not been matched by a simultaneous reexamination of control over decision making within most institutions of higher education. We are therefore urging our own faculty to examine and clarify:

1. The historical and current reasons for differentiating between M.A. and M.Ed., and between Ph.D. and Ed.D., degrees

2. Implications of these differences for staffing, admissions, curriculum, personnel actions, and all aspects of graduate professional education

3. Judgments about the relative quality of the degrees compared, and different operational definitions of "quality"

4. Decision-making control and accountability for M.Ed. and Ed.D. programs.

The lack of differentiation between graduate degrees has led to innumerable unnecessary and unproductive conflicts and compromises and, ultimately, to a reduction in standards for all of graduate education. For example, a graduate faculty in arts and sciences determines that, to remain on the graduate faculty, every member must publish X scholarly works in Y refereed journals over Z semesters. This may be an eminently reasonable criterion where the primary role for the faculty members in question is guiding, directing, and assessing the work of graduate students preparing to be scholars and researchers. It may also be an appropriate criterion for certain faculty members in education where the specialty is research or an aspect of knowledge development. It is not, however, an appropriate generalized criterion for all faculty members who are critical to a high-quality, doctoral level professional school. Thus, when faced with a yes/no choice, we are forced to oppose adoption of the criterion. Whether the final answer is yes or no, there are unavoidably losers in this process.

Another example which persists as an issue in our institution is the use of Graduate Record Examination scores and grade point averages as admission criteria and institutional quality measures. For middle-class

12

students recently out of college, these are excellent predictors of academic success in terms of test-taking ability and overall academic achievement. However, when the candidate for admission is between 25 and 50 years of age and oriented toward a practitioner role in an educational setting, the GRE-GPA indicators can and should be superseded by other factors, especially by the candidate's demonstrated ability to perform in a work setting. When graduate professional education is regarded as integral to and subsumed by the general arts and sciences graduate process, and when criteria and standards are identified and applied on a campus-wide basis, necessary modifications for graduate professional education either will not occur, or will occur at considerable expense to goodwill and to others' aspirations for a different kind of quality.

We educators in colleges and universities are often our own worst enemies because although we recognize the low status schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) hold on most campuses, we compensate by compounding the problem. We often exhort ourselves and colleagues to improve quality--and these very exhortations presume and confirm the appropriateness of arts and sciences standards. We hail the quality of graduate institutions from which our faculty members come, the high academic caliber of our graduate students, the sophistication of research designs displayed by a sample of our dissertations over the past five years, the excellence of faculty publications, the rigor of our academic and personnel review procedures, and the very substantial course load being carried by our faculty members. However, we are relatively silent about the diversity of our faculty, the alternative admission criteria used in selecting many graduate candidates, the project dissertations that have been completed, the faculty members who are excellent but don't publish, the private adaptations of curriculum review processes to facilitate off-campus work, and the extensive use of external clinical personnel as a fundamental teaching resource in the School. Silence is damning. Unlike our colleagues in medicine and law, we have not insisted on the independence necessary even to think adequately about the appropriate nature of graduate professional education.

In a 1975 study including interviews with 70 academic departments and 14 graduate deans, Breneman concluded:

> The financial stress and changing market conditions experienced by departments in the "Arts and Sciences" disciplines have not stimulated many major program changes. Rather, most departments visited in the course of this study seem to be following a conservative, "enclave" strategy designed to maintain the status quo. During the site visits little evidence was observed of leadership on the part of graduate faculty or administrators in pressing for a reexamination of the goals and purposes of the various graduate programs (1975, p. 78).

Mayhew also detailed the "inertia" of graduate education in the arts and sciences and observed that professional schools have displayed far greater change, innovation, and effort to reform. He attributed the difference primarily to the public visibility of professional schools.

> First, and probably most important, the professional practice of a physician, lawyer, architect, engineer, or even businessman is much more visible to the public and more open to public scrutiny and public pressure. Faculties concerned with the preparation of practitioners

therefore have a very real professional and economic stake in public regard for practitioners (1972, p. 1).

In deriving his examples, Mayhew cited medicine, law, architecture, engineering, and business. It is time for education to add itself to the list.

Curriculum

The curriculum of professional education will be concerned with designing learning environments for more diverse settings and wide-ranging populations. Designs will focus on both personal (or individual) and institutional growth. Given the rapid advances of technology and knowledge in specialized fields, as well as the increased recognition of the desirability of cultural pluralism in American society, professional education can anticipate an unprecedented tension between--and yet demand for both--specialization and generalization in the design and conduct of graduate study. Institutional prescription will compete with student determination of graduate programs of study. The public in general, and organized teaching and human service professions in particular, will demand an even greater voice in shaping the graduate education curriculum. State and federal mandates in the form of certification regulations and funding policies will influence curriculum even more as private sources of funds decrease and the job market for graduates becomes less focused and more regulated. The shift from a goods- to a services-oriented economy will create a whole set of roles which are appropriately described as educational and for which preparation will be inadequate unless we reorient our curricula accordingly. Given these realities, we at the University of Massachusetts School of Education are currently involved in reassessing future directions.

We have used several "givens" in attempting to project graduate curricular decisions at our own school:

- Education is a formal and informal process which takes place in homes, schools, places of worship, community agencies, and businesses; it occurs through a variety of modes of communication; it is a lifelong process.

- Education and training are different, and we must be concerned with both.

- Many of the roles for which our graduates prepare will be replaced or redefined in coming decades; a majority of our graduates will make significant role changes, both in and outside the scope of formal education, during their careers.

- Professional education in any sphere is characterized by the development of knowledge and theory on the one hand and its effective clinical application on the other. Each is integral and both are interdependent in professional education.

- Any institution must eschew the temptation to be all things to all people; what an institution can be is primarily a function of its faculty talents, potential, and aspirations.

- The graduate student population in education is increasingly experienced, mature, and self-directed.
- Education is a value-transmitting and value-creating process.
- Graduate education prepares educational leaders.

While none of these "givens" is particularly original, each is useful and can be translated into mandates or guidelines for future directions and for the ways in which we plan, organize, and conduct graduate education. After extensive debate and examination, we have used the following guidelines in particular to provide us with a sense of direction and stability:

1. The historical and future role of schools should be acknowledged, and the educational role of other agencies and institutions should also be formally recognized. Both are necessary agendas for professional education.
2. Graduate programs need to be developed around generic rather than narrow categorical foci.
3. Clinical settings are a critical, integral part of the process of graduate professional education.
4. An institution's graduate programs are more appropriately governed by a series of process and quality, rather than content, criteria.
5. Any graduate education program should provide evidence of, and insist on the development of, clear and reasoned value positions that will guide graduates' behavior.

The international and human services education programs at the University of Massachusetts illustrate two appropriate arenas for expanded graduate professional education. While each has value in its own right, each also has the added attribute of providing perspective on more school-oriented practice.

International Programs. In discussing past and proposed activities of the Center for International Education at the University, Program Director David Evans said:

> Throughout its history the Center has been involved in working out a process whose goal is to involve people in their own development. The adaption of Freirian consciousness-raising approaches, the use of participatory processes in activities ranging from materials development to project design, and the attempt to design and implement a collaboration approach to the field sites, all of these reflect the commitment of the Center to a particular goal and style of nonformal education and of the developmental process in general (1978).

Evans cited roles and functions which are developed within the Center's efforts and for which graduate students provide technical assistance: village and community development, the creation of adult literacy and vocational training programs, materials production and training development, and addressing and resolving a host of specific developmental issues in a wide range of settings.

Human Services Programs. Bailey Jackson et al. defined human services as "a field that adheres to an educational orientation to promote the realization of human potential" (1978, p. 4). They described doctoral level work in the field within four areas of emphasis: Service Delivery, Administration and Management, Training, and Research and Evaluation.

Human services is regarded as holistic, consumer determined, problem generated, and assistance oriented. As such, our international and human services programs address agendas fundamental to education in all settings. Their added virtue is that they operate far enough afield to be relatively unfettered by tradition, thereby offering the opportunity for perspective on close-to-home problems and issues.

Graduate programs must be generic. No group is duller than that which is homogeneous. No training is more dead-end than that which prepares superb bloodletters in an era of internal medicine. We have studiously avoided the development of graduate level programs to prepare people for narrowly defined roles because the narrow role orientation imposes potential blinders for faculty and students alike, because such training is likely to be of only transitory value, and because the greater specialization predicts a concurrent limitation on the people and ideas the student will encounter. We prepare leaders and administrators, but we are careful not to isolate those involved in higher education from those involved in special education or vocational education or, for that matter, from superintendents, principals, or program officers.

Any graduate program must have significant clinical settings which are integral to the design of graduate study. At the University of Massachusetts School of Education, we are developing two types: topical resource centers and field-based laboratory sites. The former are interdisciplinary campus-based centers where written resources are stored; faculty and students come together to bring their particular expertise to bear on a topic of current concern; and team research is conducted and disseminated. The latter are a variety of schools and other agencies representing a range of types, levels, and settings in which faculty and students can practice. A formal relationship exists between these laboratory sites and the University, with participants at the sites expecting to benefit equally from the University contacts. Thus, this relationship is mutually beneficial for all involved.

Topical Resource Centers currently being developed include:

- The Center for Alternatives in Education--an outgrowth of our National Alternative Schools Program
- The Center for Equal Educational Opportunity--a new thrust developed from our Urban Education and Foundations Program and from the relocation of Meyer Weinberg, his library, and the journal, *Integrateducation*, to the School
- The Center for Applied Genetic Epistemology--dedicated to applying Piagetian principles; developed in conjunction with Piaget in

Geneva, with the assistance of Eleanor Duckworth from Geneva and a variety of University faculty members and students

- The Center for Collective Bargaining in Education--initiated jointly by the University's Labor Relations Center, School of Business, and School of Education Administration Program

- The Non-Formal Education Center--developed by the School's International Education Program in collaboration with faculty members and students in teacher education, staff development, and multicultural education; and with educators and community members from Ecuador, Ghana, Thailand, and Indonesia

- The Center for Futures in Education--an arm of the School's Future Studies Program, in collaboration with Buckminster Fuller and the Division of Continuing Education.

Field-Based Laboratory Sites are local, regional, and international. On campus, the Infant Day Care Center, University Day School, and University Laboratory School are run wholly by School of Education personnel and represent preschool and early childhood education clinics. The Mark's Meadow Laboratory School (K-6) and the Hampshire Educational Collaborative's Alternative School (5-9) operate in University facilities with some additional financial support by the School of Education, but primary operating authority resides with an external board. The Advocate Program, a school and community for juvenile offenders, is housed and run by the School of Education with external support, and represents one clinical site for students in human service concentrations.

Regionally, close and contractual relationships exist with the Amherst, Worcester, and Boston schools; the latter two are currently secondary level sites. Explorations are underway to develop one entire K-12 district in Boston as a primary clinical setting for the School. Sites nationally and internationally, especially a Pueblo school in New Mexico and a public school in Bristol, England, are also systematically tied to the School of Education.

Both the topical resource centers and field-based laboratory sites are designed to encourage generic and cross-disciplinary approaches. Both are geared to and can accommodate the needs of part-time and full-time students and faculty.

Graduate study at the School of Education is and will probably continue to be highly prescriptive in terms of processes and largely nonprescriptive in terms of content. Particularly at the doctoral level where the student population is generally experienced and highly self-directed, the locus of program decisions is shared between the candidate and a three-member advisory committee. The major required process steps are: forming the committee, developing a comprehensive program of study, passing a written and oral comprehensive exam, developing a dissertation proposal, and completing and defending the work.

Recent trends which seem valuable include:

1. Substantial practicum work, both in University teaching and other internships, as part of the designed program of study

2. An increase in the range of methodologies used in dissertations; a trend away from highly controlled experimental designs and toward historical, anthropological, and sociological designs

3. Greater explicit connection between all aspects of doctoral study and specific issues facing practitioners, who comprise a large proportion of our doctoral students.

Recent trends which pose dangers for the effectiveness of doctoral study include:

1. A tendency to specialize from the start, without assuring breadth of knowledge as well as communication with others about their work and ideas

2. Some excesses of tinkering with practical solutions of present problems without sufficient historical and theoretical underpinnings

3. An automatic response on the part of some faculty members, when faced with issues such as #1 and #2, to propose prescriptions that cure the occasional ills but that often serve unwittingly to set limits on the potentially most creative aspects of the system.

Personnel

Diversity is critical in a graduate education faculty. Therefore at the University of Massachusetts School of Education we have sought and will continue to seek the following mix:

1. Faculty members whose training and expertise are in traditional areas of education: curriculum, foundations, instruction, research, evaluation, administration, counseling

2. Practitioners with proven records of distinction working in schools, social service agencies, and administrative posts

3. Faculty members whose training, background, and expertise are in the social sciences and who are interested in applying their expertise to issues of education

4. A few mavericks--brilliant people, distinguished but difficult to categorize in traditional academic terms--who are interested in education and who contribute significantly different perspectives to the enterprise

5. A group of part-time experts whose primary employment is elsewhere but who profit from association with, and provide needed expertise to, the institution; these can fit into any of the categories (#1-#4).

Graduate professional education has historically recruited its faculty from categories #1 and #2. We suggest that, as faculties become more stable and the need for staff revitalization increases, the last category will take on major significance. As we consider the economic constraints most of us face, part-time experts become even more appealing in cost-benefit terms.

Perhaps the basic criterion for any graduate education faculty, especially where individualized doctoral study is valued, can be framed by a simple question faculty members can ask themselves: If I were on a perpetual sabbatical, do my colleagues represent a resource which I could tap, and from which I could grow significantly, for the rest of my career?

Fiscal-Organizational Concerns

The costs of graduate professional education are increasing at a more rapid rate than most other areas of graduate study, for several reasons: as the proportion of field-based clinical work for faculty expands, so do costs; as the graduate student population is increasingly mature and experienced, so is its need for financial support; as more and more programs in graduate professional education are designed jointly with collaborating outside agencies, the need for planning time, as well as the need for staff support to attend to vastly more complex management demands, expand geometrically.

We have taken steps to begin addressing these harsh economic realities:

1. Within the University, we are attempting to demonstrate to those who allocate dollars to units that, as we reduce undergraduate enrollments, increase graduate level activities, and move more of our work off-campus, new formulas are needed for allocating equitable dollars to the School. The historical student-credit hour model for determining allocations is simply not appropriate in our present context.

2. Inside the School, we have placed priority on, and allocated increased funds for, development activities. Grants and contracts, we estimate, must at least equal our University allocation if we are to function effectively. Our clinical sites need more systematic linkages with the School, including specific position and budget reserves for graduate degree candidates.

3. Such resource centers as those described earlier will include as part of their function contracting for services to local, state, federal, and international agencies. Doctoral students will be instrumental, with faculty members, in delivering these services.

4. Sabbaticals, while limited for public school personnel, represent a somewhat randomly tapped resource for graduate student support. An analysis of purposes for which local districts grant sabbaticals indicates substantial correlation with many current components of graduate programs. We intend to accentuate the congruency and encourage local districts to use the School as a more substantial resource.

Organizationally, we are in the process of closing a set of circuits which can increase our educational and economic efficiency and effectiveness. While we have sought a synergetic interplay between undergraduate and graduate, preservice and inservice programs, until recently we have largely ignored graduate alumni as a source of teaching assistance, internships, political support, and dollars for all aspects of our work. While we have long recognized the value of learning by experience, of learning by teaching, of learning through creating products of value to others, we have been unsophisticated in recognizing and developing the economic potential of these values for supporting graduate education. While we acknowledge the increased financial burdens faced by full-time graduate students, and are aware that ever larger portions of graduate study are being completed on a part-time basis, we have not systematically tapped a major resource--sabbatical dollars for teachers and administrators--in our graduate programming.

In short, conditions require that graduate education, both academically and organizationally, assume a more open system orientation and recognize its dependence upon, and interdependence with, individuals and agencies outside the boundaries of the academy and the current schooling system.

REFERENCES

Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

Breneman, David W. Graduate School Adjustments to the "New Depression" in Higher Education. Technical Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: National Board on Graduate Education, National Academy of Sciences, 1975.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Education of the Educating Professions. 19th Annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Evans, David. "Summer Report, Four Year Review." Monograph. Amherst: University of Massachusetts School of Education, Center for International Education, May 1978.

Jackson, Bailey, et al. "The Human Services Program." Report presented to the University of Massachusetts School of Education Faculty Retreat, September 1978.

Janis, Irving Lester. Victims of Group Think (a psychological study of foreign policy decisions and fiascos). Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Graduate and Professional Education, 1980: A Survey of Institutional Plans. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Reform in Graduate Education. Research Monograph No. 18. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1972.

National Board on Graduate Education. Outlook and Opportunities for Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: The Board, December 1975.

Nonformal Education Program. Summary Report, 1974-1978. Amherst: University of Massachusetts School of Education, Center for International Education, 1978.

RECONCEPTUALIZING GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION

Carl J. Dolce

Because of significant variations in graduate programs, generalizations will not apply to the many exceptions that exist, and therefore will be faulty. However, this discussion will address central tendencies in graduate programs in Education without attempting to account for the exceptions. Although ignoring the exceptions may limit the utility and applicability of this analysis, considering characteristics manifested by most institutions does have usefulness insofar as such institutions shape perceptions of the status of graduate programs in Education and have an impact.

DILEMMAS FOR PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Since graduate programs are subsets of professional education, it is not feasible to examine graduate programs outside of the larger context. Perceptions of professional education as a field of inquiry and a field of professional preparation very much influence the status of graduate programs and the allocation of resources to those programs. Current perceptions are also the product of the historical development of professional education, and many of the issues and dilemmas are the result of both recently developed conditions and the historical development of the field.

The mood in schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) at this time is one of depression and, in some quarters, despair. Enrollments are declining and resources are being reduced because of recently emerging and currently operating variables. However, there are other long-term conditions that influence SCDEs and the milieu of graduate programs in Education.

Status Among Professional Schools

The status of professional education is not and has not been very high. Although the time has passed when professional education was widely viewed as unnecessary and certainly not worthy of a place in the university, the relative status of professional education, particularly graduate programs, on most campuses is toward the lower end of the spectrum. The grudging concession that a good general education is not sufficient for either disciplined inquiry in such areas as instruction or effective professional performance has not been accompanied by greater respect and higher esteem. Acceptance of professional education as a valid field of inquiry which has a rightful place in a university has resulted from recognition of the complexities of problems in education, the profound social implications of those problems, and the inability of "outsiders" to resolve those problems. It is such recognition, rather than a respect for the contributions of professional education, that has legitimized the field of study.

Low campus status is accompanied currently by a concerted effort to wrest credentialing functions away from SCDEs. Several state departments of education have shifted the emphasis in inservice education from college and university courses to non-higher education based and operated workshops. By means of such mechanisms as teacher centers, the organized teacher groups are clearly aiming at both preservice and inservice education freed from the dominance of higher education and controlled by teacher organizations. The lack of status on campus, the disaffection of many state departments of education, and the power grab by teacher organizations lead one to wonder where support is for professional education programs in higher education. The declining need for professionals produced by graduate programs, the decreasing enrollments, and the shrinking resource bases all contribute to a rather pessimistic picture.

Maintenance of Enrollments and Resources

The usual organizational response to perceived threat is to blame problems on external causes, to become more rigid, and to oversimplify problem definition. Institutions have tended to define the problems of graduate programs in Education rather simplistically, essentially as a question of maintaining and increasing resources--primarily through maintaining and if possible increasing enrollments. Such a definition is faulty and is leading to counterproductive consequences. Although resources are a necessary condition, they are in themselves insufficient; and certain alternatives used in acquiring and maintaining resources will have serious unintended results.

Efforts seem to be aimed primarily at organizational conservation rather than at attainment of organizational objectives. When the need for graduates of preservice programs began to diminish perceptibly, the current emphasis on attention to inservice programs developed--not so much because of the educational need (which has always existed) but because of the perceived need to maintain enrollments and resources. Little effort has been made to control the output of surplus graduates in such fields as social studies, English, and school administration and supervision. As long as the supply of students continued to expand, there was little concern about overproduction. Now that the supply of students has diminished as a result of a rational individual (rather than institutional) response to market conditions of oversupply, institutions are viewing such alternatives as off-campus degree programs, external degree programs, lowering of admission standards, and reduction in program requirements. Such attempts are within the framework of reasons for the low campus status of teacher education.

Such self-serving reactions will do little to resolve problems faced by graduate programs in Education. A more rational response pattern with long-term benefits can be developed by analyzing the substantive problems of professional education. First and foremost, there is a need to upgrade the quality of research concerning the problems and the environment of instruction, administration, supervision, and related functions. A field of professional inquiry and preparation cannot transcend its substantive base. Course content, the focus of inquiry and preparation, decisions about the characteristics of students and of those who complete graduate programs, and judgments about program effectiveness should all be rooted in the substantive field, because it is the substantive field that distinguishes the various aspects of graduate education, such as engineering, medicine, education, and architecture.

Knowledge Production

It is ironic that widespread recognition of the complexities of instruction, administration, and so forth arose primarily among those whose specialization is in areas other than education. Certainly, a review of the literature in education reveals too little acknowledgment of the plethora of unresolved problems and too great an emphasis on ideological commitment to particular "successful" attempts or solutions. Absence of substantive progress and insensitivity to social issues are two of the basic reasons SCDEs have had so little impact on public policy. Such societal trends as the effort to eliminate sex and racial bias in schools and concern for the education of the poor were not stimulated primarily by faculties in Education; political responses such as the ESEA Title I legislation were not the primary handiwork of those faculties; and education specialists were not in the forefront of many policy study endeavors, where nonspecialists have dominated. The noticeable absence of educators in all of these movements reflects a lack of leadership and initiative. Campus status, impact on public policy, and influence as a profession will result from the development of substantive knowledge and social sensitivity, not from frenetic attempts to maintain enrollments or to preserve boundaries. It is the graduate faculty which should be uniquely qualified to develop and transmit such knowledge. Because teacher organizations, state departments of education, and politicians have other agendas and face multitudes of operational problems, they are ill-suited for the knowledge production function.

In a misdirected effort to increase status levels, such fields as psychology and education attempted in the past to adopt the methodologies of more respected fields such as the sciences, but such efforts have not been very productive. The form of inquiry per se is not nearly so significant as the development of capabilities to resolve significant problems. As problem-solving capabilities increase, so will status and rewards. The past two decades have been characterized by too many attempts to capture resources for research in order to maintain the organization rather than to facilitate the development of knowledge and insights. As priorities of the funding source changed, sometimes within a few months, so did the interests of researchers. Frequent shifts in focus and the absence of sustained inquiry have lessened the impact of resources allocated for research purposes. As education matures as a field of study, as it develops more effective methodologies instead of emulating other disciplines, and as its research effort becomes more long-range, sustained, and skilled, so will status, rewards, and security increase.

Development of substantive knowledge is the primary earmark of graduate programs. However, a sense of intellectual humility is needed: the complexities of problems and the inadequacy of present knowledge must be acknowledged. For example, the objective of developing universal literacy through the schools is an awesome one, and should be recognized as such. Although the schools have achieved success in developing literacy among a sizable percentage of children and adults, within the context of an ideal of universal literacy the large percentage of functional illiterates is alarmingly high. Experience to date has indicated that rhetoric, exhortation, and finger-pointing do not provide the keys to resolving such a complex problem. Furthermore, survey research--which seems to be increasingly used in doctoral dissertations and faculty research efforts--adds little insight. The prerequisite intellectual humility could facilitate a knowledge and implementation breakthrough, which would enhance significantly the status and influence of graduate programs.

The importance of programs and the rewards allocated to them are not so much a function of the guild's political prowess as of the importance of the problems addressed and the capability for contributing to resolution of those problems. Education will continue to be of central importance to society, and such importance offers graduate programs a base of security. What is missing is the perception and reality of capability.

The Gatekeeping Function

In addition to the knowledge production function, graduate programs in education share other characteristics with graduate programs in other fields. For example, graduate programs serve as gatekeepers, to determine who shall and who shall not be licensed to practice in a more professional capacity, such as supervisor and administrator. Such positions establish the direction for schools and school systems, and credentials based on receipt of a graduate degree are prerequisite to holding these higher level positions. A frequency count of the number of ineffective and/or insensitive supervisors, principals, central office personnel, and superintendents indicates that the gatekeeping function is not being performed very effectively. Since virtually all of those who are in decision-making positions have been legitimized by graduate programs, each case where capability is lacking represents a program failure. If graduate programs performed no other function than to screen out the incapable and legitimize only the capable, an invaluable societal contribution would be made--even assuming no effectiveness of programs themselves.

It is no secret in the profession that academic qualifications of students admitted to both undergraduate and graduate programs in Education tend to be lower than the qualifications of those admitted to graduate programs in other fields. These lower qualifications do not seem to be taken very seriously by many SCDE faculty members, who often respond that there are other characteristics which are more important. Such a response seems to assert not that intellectual prowess and disciplined education are necessary but insufficient conditions but, instead, that intellectual prowess and disciplined education are really not important at all. In other words, the intellectually mediocre and inadequately educated can be effective in achieving an ideal future. In still other words, the problems faced are so simple that intellectual prowess and disciplined education are not needed. This view of the relative simplicity of educational problems is too often jettisoned when educators are faced with the deficiencies in the existing system; then the emphasis seems to shift to the complexity of the problems.

University faculties cannot have it both ways: either the problems do require highly intelligent and educated practitioners, or they do not. If highly intelligent and educated practitioners are needed, the gatekeeping function must screen out those who are not sufficiently intelligent or educated. The screening-out may take place at the admissions stage, the completion stage, or any stage in between; however, it should take place sometime prior to credentialing. Relatively low admissions standards, relatively low failure rates, and a high percentage of candidates who complete graduate programs all indicate that the gatekeeping function is not being performed very well.

The current drive to maintain resources by means of maintaining enrollments points to an even more ineffective discharge of the gatekeeping function. In addition, the one reward possessed exclusively by higher education--the degree--is further cheapened. State departments of education, teacher organizations, and local education agencies may develop alternatives to credentialing. However, there is little probability that they can develop an effective degree-awarding alternative. Because of the low standards used in legitimizing professionals in education, those who have been legitimized by alternative means are not demonstrably less proficient than those who completed graduate programs. What is the rational basis, then, for insisting that credentialing and degrees be viewed as synonymous? Current society is a credentialed and credentialing one in which the receipt of a degree is prerequisite to issuance of a professional credential. Although a coupling of degree and credential in other fields provides support for similar coupling in Education, the ineffective discharge of the gatekeeping function threatens to stimulate an uncoupling.

Socialization of Candidates

It is generally assumed that graduate programs perform more than the gatekeeping function and do, in fact, develop the desired characteristics in those who have the potential. Graduate programs in Education appear to fall short on this dimension also. With few exceptions, they have been patterned on the model of a mass production factory. Large numbers of students are admitted, and are processed through coursework in a relatively short time into graduates credentialed as professionals. On the master's degree level, there is little or no pretense that socialization is an essential aspect of professional education. Furthermore, despite protests to the contrary, course offerings seem to concentrate on information transmission. Insights about the influence of modeling and the effects on students of an institutional environment seem to be ignored. Concerns for such issues as cultural pluralism, equity for women, and equal opportunities for the handicapped are usually expressed by means of add-on courses or modules. It is doubtful that a male-dominated faculty which does not itself display equity for women can transmit such a sense of equity by means of a course; or that a faculty or student population reflecting a single racial composition with little intellectual diversity can transmit a feel for and acceptance of cultural pluralism.

RECONCEPTUALIZING GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Graduate programs largely appear to consist of an aggregate of courses influenced in part by the concern to maintain program enrollments. Such programs lack a conceptual wholeness based on the best state of existing knowledge. A more adequate conceptualization of a program would allow more open-minded inquiry into the use of courses which are offered by fields other than education but which have utility for professional education. It would also allow consideration of the gestalt of experiences planned as part of a particular program and the raising of questions about missing elements in that program.

Dissolving the Research/Teaching Dichotomy

Certain traditional assumptions have tended to impede progress in graduate programs. The first of these is the bifurcation of professional preparation programs into those designed for the practitioner and those designed for the scholar. Although the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. degrees were developed on the basis of that bifurcation, the distinctions have failed to achieve any meaningfulness, and the disadvantages of two doctoral degrees have far outweighed the advantages. The one advantage seems to have been that the Ed.D. programs were tolerable for such low status in a climate in which authority to grant the Ph.D. would have been withheld.

Such distinctions between practitioners and scholars are based on faulty assumptions; the membrane between the two has been extremely porous. For example, graduates of "practitioner" programs have pursued careers in colleges and universities, supposedly the province of the scholar; while graduates of "scholarly" programs have pursued careers in school systems and public agencies, and many are active in both higher education and school systems. Assumptions about the differential needs for research competencies also do not appear valid. Some Ed.D. programs have heavy research emphasis and some Ph.D. programs very little research emphasis. Some practitioners have found great usefulness for research skills; some scholars seem never to have developed such skills. A more adequate conceptualization should avoid such invalid assumptions, particularly where real world experiences and data are used as the basis for observations. Perhaps the time is near when the use of the Ed.D. can be discontinued.

The invalid bifurcation of research and teaching has also created conceptual problems in program development. If an essential aspect of graduate education is knowledge production and the transmission of knowledge production skills to students, then research is an essential aspect of graduate level teaching. Proficiency in research is often seen as precluding proficiency in teaching or vice versa. Such a conclusion is obviated by the many examples in which both functions are performed in a mutually reinforcing way. The juxtaposition of research as the opposite of teaching is evidenced most often by those who do not have proficiency in one or the other, or both.

Accepting Service as an Essential Function

The view of service as a function unrelated to and separate from the other traditional functions--teaching and research--has also created problems for graduate programs, inasmuch as service is a primary mechanism for demonstrating the utility of graduate faculty members and their expertise in addressing real world problems. Highly effective service is more convincing to policy makers and clientele than volumes of rhetoric or research reports. As used here, "service" means technical assistance. Often the term is used to denote the offering of instruction off-campus, but that use and the failure to add further definition have resulted in a confusion between inservice education and degree programs.

Equating inservice education and degree programs is a serious conceptual error. It is true that degree programs can serve as a means of inservice education. However, inservice education often involves students who do not have sufficient qualifications for graduate study. Inservice programs also often have low expectations or program content which is not sufficiently rigorous to merit graduate study status. To feel obligated to award a degree or academic credit for inservice education activities threatens to diminish further the value of such degrees and credits. If the two concepts are differentiated, inservice education activities can be viewed as activities which are appropriately shared with local education agencies, teacher centers, and/or state departments of public education. To retain effective control of academic credit and degrees in higher education is to retain a major sanction which is available only to higher education.

A reconceptualization of graduate programs which avoids invalid and unnecessary distinctions between research and teaching, between practitioner and scholar, and between campus functions and external service would provide a strong platform for realistic future-oriented development. Differentiation between academic credit and degrees on the one hand and inservice education on the other would allow a more realistic determination of which agency is in the position to offer the most effective services.

Focusing on Substantive Issues

Such phenomena as declining enrollments really represent rational responses to perceived market conditions. Rather than attempting to maintain such enrollments artificially, at almost any cost, SCDEs should focus on the complexities of the field of study, the characteristics needed by professionals to contribute to the resolution of significant problems, and the types of graduate programs required. A focus on the development of substantive knowledge, the effective discharge of the gatekeeping function, and a more adequate program conceptualization might appear to avoid what many consider the "real" issues--resources and power. However, such a focus really is on the elements prerequisite to resources and power.

Without the prerequisites the ends are elusive. Graduate programs in education do not have the political clout on campuses to capture added resources. In the hurly-burly of federal, state, and local politics, organized groups such as teacher organizations, chief state school officers, and school board associations have significant advantages which only the naive believe can be finessed. The extent to which faculty and programs are respected for their capability of contributing to the solution of pressing education problems will largely determine their influence and the flow of resources. In the absence of sufficient political resources both on and off campus, this is the only viable alternative. And after all, isn't program effectiveness our raison d'etre?

Reducing Organizational Size

Enrollment decline will have a differential impact on institutions. For programs and units with large numbers of faculty members, the prospect of a reduced number should not be viewed as an organizational disaster. Bigger isn't necessarily better; small medical school faculties wield an inordinate amount of influence and have a high degree of impact. The essential question is, "What is the smallest number of faculty members needed to offer a viable program of high quality?" The answer seems to be that the smallest viable number is much smaller than most programs and units believe it to be.

For programs and units with small faculties, the issue is organizational survival, and in most of these there is little likelihood that concerns about the substantive field will be near center stage. Some will not survive--a prospect which, while disastrous for the organization, is insignificant in terms of the larger scene. Others will survive but will continue to be overwhelmed by the problem of survival; and from these institutions, little contribution can be expected. Still others will grapple with immediate survival and at the same time confront the larger issues. These programs and units have the potential of making significant contributions.

SUMMARY

It is perhaps presumptuous to say, but nonetheless true, that too many institutions are either unable or unwilling to support graduate programs in Education adequately. The problems faced by graduate programs in Education are in large part internal. Successful resolution of these internal problems will enable the programs to deal with externally generated problems from a position of strength, without which there is low probability of success in dealing with such third-order problems as "credit" earned in teacher centers or alternative means of delivering inservice education. From a position of strength, public policy and the field of practice can be influenced in vitally positive ways.

GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION: SOME ISSUES, CONCERNS, AND CHALLENGES

Dale Nitzschke and Joseph Lamberti

Graduate teacher education programs are destined to grow and prosper where all elements contributing to the health of such programs are working in unison to see that a high quality of education is the end result. A governing board that adopts a mission statement encouraging "leadership in the development of programs for the preservice and inservice preparation of teachers and other educational personnel for schools, colleges, and universities" has given direction and support for pursuing programs of excellence. With such a mandate, the climate is right for faculty and administrators to perform in relative freedom in the delivery and development of graduate teacher education programs. Historically, and currently, top-level encouragement here at the University of Northern Iowa has prompted the teacher education faculty to act with confidence, knowing that support would be available as programs have matured and developed.

University administrators have shown support in a variety of ways. One example is the appointment of a Director of Teacher Education who provides a coordinating and leadership role for university-wide teacher education concerns. This office lends credence to the primacy of the total university community; campus-wide support and approval are needed, from the presidential to the departmental level, if teacher education is to remain a vital all-university responsibility. The strong support emanating from a central position naturally prompts strong support from other programmatic and administrative units as well. This top-down spread of support has helped us retain our role as the prime teacher education institution in the state.

Another contributor to effective graduate teacher education programs is the willingness of faculty members in academic departments and colleges to take individual responsibility for promoting and assisting in the development of high-quality programs. Without the faculty's broad-based support and professional dedication to our graduate programs, students in education would be in danger of gaining a too-narrow view of their responsibilities.

It is also reassuring to know that the College of Education can enjoy the freedom to operate individualistically within the larger university structure. This freedom permits response to ad hoc demands that seem more frequent today than in the past. Whereas bureaucratic controls and demands can stifle initiative, autonomy of governance and program development can be a spur to individual excellence among the faculty, and can result in broader participation and enrichment.

An institution that boasts of a laboratory school as an adjunct to its program in graduate teacher education can count itself fortunate. Laboratory school staff members, who enjoy equal university professional rank and position with their colleagues in other departments, can truly be labeled teacher-scholars. While supervising and instructing in a K-12 setting, they are concurrently pursuing a variety of research projects in an attempt to refine and define knowledge of teaching and learning. They share their discoveries with colleagues in professional education as a mutual responsibility. New information is included in preparation courses and ultimately will be tested in various settings so that the research becomes a developmental, cooperative effort to improve the teaching-learning process.

Research opportunities for graduate students as well as significant longitudinal studies by interested faculty are easily accessible and can serve to extend basic knowledge about teaching and learning. This research, as well as an ongoing educational program that enjoys a reputation as a superb individualized experience, make the laboratory school a vitally important extension of our graduate programs in teacher education.

In addition, the excitement of being part of a graduate program in transition provides many opportunities for developing programs in response to current pressures and demands without being locked into outdated dogma that could slow progress. This flexibility is crucial in a time when colleges and universities are being deluged with external demands and requirements that impede the task of development. It is imperative that institutions be pro-active and include these impingements into programs, rather than reactive and piecemeal in their approach. To this end, the UNI administration, under the leadership of the Director of Teacher Education and a select committee, has undertaken a comprehensive study of teacher education at our institution. The expectations of all involved in professional education are high indeed. The study will provide focus and direction to current programming plans after careful analysis of more than 100 years of teacher education tradition. Past achievements will need to be melded into present and future demands as continued development ensues.

Our situation is extremely positive in context. We would be foolish to state that we are not prone to the same demands and pressures others have felt in lesser or greater degrees. Our situation may be different, however, in that all indications show we are still in a position to confront the major problems facing graduate teacher education and can respond to them with confidence that we are acting with the full support of our governing board, our central administration, and our colleagues in the university. With this support, we face the future confidently, but we are aware also of elements in the society at large that will require creative response as problems and issues emerge.

CURRENT ISSUES

It is difficult to imagine how teacher education, either undergraduate or graduate, can survive in institutions that provide less support. Even under such advantageous conditions as ours, teacher education--particularly graduate teacher education--faces an uncertain future. Many colleges and universities are undergoing some form of reorganization aimed at improving (making more appealing) their lot on and off campus. In many cases they are finding it is too late or the pressures are now too great to allow them to respond quickly enough, and with appropriate deliberation and consultation. In institutions in which graduate teacher education does not enjoy institution-wide commitment, there seems to be little hope for survival. And perhaps there shouldn't be! Possibly we can do with fewer programs and demand higher quality performance from those that remain.

For the very best programs in graduate teacher education, perplexing problems remain and major issues beg resolution. Graduate teacher education has succumbed to pressures that have plagued undergraduate education as well as elementary and secondary education. Subtle and not so subtle forces have been at work chipping away at the rigorous quality that should be inherent in all kinds of professional preparation at the graduate level.

As illustrations of such forces:

1. There is an increased trend toward part-time graduate study, whereby graduate degree status is achieved through the not-so-careful selection of a discrete set of courses, rather than a full-time intensive graduate level experience. Graduate students in many cases are employed full-time and engage in graduate level work on a part-time, convenience schedule, and sometimes only if required to do so. There is some rather disturbing evidence that this accommodation is even being extended to those pursuing doctoral level preparation. Institutions are falling into a credit-generation trap and are being played one against the other to make their programs the most convenient for part-timers. The frightening spectre of mail order diplomas, so casually dismissed just a few years ago, is becoming a reality in our "I can get it for you wholesale" merchandising of graduate programs.

2. There is increased emphasis on field study or on-the-job experience at the expense of substantive, academic learning experiences. For the sake of "relevance," graduate teacher education has become saturated with an infinite variety of sometimes ill-conceived and often shabbily administered "practitioner" requirements. Instruction in the use of basic and tested educational tools for learning has been forsaken in order to provide more "hands-on" or "real-life" experiences. Make-it-and-take-it experiences have been substituted for the arduous task of thinking. Academic study appears to have been abandoned to the undergraduate programs and is too seldom evident at the graduate level. This trend follows from the previous concern, in that since we cannot expect fully employed professionals who are only part-time students to spend time and effort fulfilling challenging academic demands, the programs are changed to meet the ad hoc needs of inservice audiences. This is a classic academic case of "the terminal appendage oscillating the _canis familiaris_."

3. There appears to be increased emphasis on serving the needs of all people of all ages wherever they may be. Institutions are packing their program bags and taking them to remote corners to meet the demands that exist "out there." In addition, programs are tailored to accommodate the local set of circumstances in order to make them more appealing, and certainly more relevant. Quality control, guaranteeing program integrity and rigor, takes a back seat to getting the program to where the people are. Institutions that have designed and can defend high-quality on-campus programs are being challenged by clientele in the field to deliver. Often institutions that balk at wholesaling graduate credit off campus are unjustly accused of being unresponsive and inflexible. It appears that the term "suitcase college" is being applied more and more to deliverers of graduate programs rather than the students.

4. There is an increased emphasis by institutions on inservice training, with resultant confusion as to what constitutes graduate level teacher education. Rather than providing a demanding, soundly conceived, and forward-looking graduate program in teacher education,

institutions are more apt to respond to needs expressed by potential recipients through the delivery of currently popular inservice "courses." In many instances these courses are conducted by on-site or "adjunct" instructors who collect the tuition fees and turn in grades when the course ends. Any attention given to institutional standards of quality are accidental if present at all. The competition among our institutions for tuition monies and students has forced us to sell credits rather than high-quality institutional programs.

5. There is a gradual, but significant, diminution of the importance of the foundations of education in graduate teacher education. Institutions have given in to accusations that foundations courses are of little or no value (relevance) and have responded by either deleting them or approaching them from the standpoint of current issues. The "critics" have forced institutions to substitute courses with contemporary flavor for those very courses that have promoted professional distinction in graduate programs. With no common heritage or foundation being shared among professional educators, there can be no united purpose from which to view the future.

6. There is a decreased emphasis on basic research methodology and design. This trend has been so pronounced, for such an extended period of time, that we now have many graduate teacher education faculty members who themselves lack basic understanding in this area. Little wonder that our graduate students are not receiving adequate exposure to these fundamental principles. Graduate teacher education is as vulnerable as our elementary and secondary schools are when it comes to instruction in the "basics." Recipients of graduate degrees must possess the appropriate tools of "learning" if they are planning to teach others how to learn.

7. There has been a gradual retreat from the inclusion of cognate areas in graduate teacher education programs. For many reasons, not the least of which is the all-powerful FTE (full-time equivalent), significant academic disciplines are playing a lesser role in requirements for graduate education programs. While the overall requirements in graduate teacher education are not increasing (in fact, there appears to be some evidence that they may be slightly decreasing), we have witnessed an increase in the professional education component and a corresponding decrease in the academic component. The generation by faculty members of their fair share of FTEs continues to be a major divisive force bent on destroying the professional logic critical to sound program planning.

8. We have seen an increased influence on the direction of graduate programs by extra-institutional dollars--outside funding coming to the institution from sources other than its normal support base. The financial crunch existing in many institutions has given more "punch" to the outside dollars (in terms of influencing programs), even though such funds are less plentiful than before. In other words, we're gettng less outside money but depending on it more. Even more influential, in a negative sense, are the "once-laundered" dollars; that is, money provided to an agency outside

the university that then purchases services from the university. Quite clearly, those who have the dollars call the shots. Here again we have abdicated our primary role as planners by allowing outside forces to control our internal programs.

9. There has been a continued expansion of policies, rules, and regulations that result in the "leveling" or "equalizing" of people and programs. These forces have their genesis both inside the institution (such as collective bargaining and promotion and tenure policies) and outside the institution (for example, affirmative action programs, Public Law 94-142, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973). One must tread lightly when hinting at the possible negative effects of such enactments. However, careful scrutiny appears to negate the notion that the quest for quality in higher education is enhanced as a result. There are times when the enforcement of these policies and regulations takes more time and effort to implement than the supposed rewards that are garnered. This is time and effort that can be recovered.

OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

It is quite possible that future options for graduate teacher education have already been dramatically reduced. For a rather long time now, we have been attempting to bend and flex to accommodate every new demand or pressure placed on us. Our attempts at being all things to all people through our graduate teacher education programs have resulted only in diminishing their quality, which in turn has substantially reduced the "premium" once attached to that level of accomplishment. At the least, the reshaping of graduate teacher education will require attention to, and action on, these fronts:

1. A clear distinction must be made between graduate teacher education on the one hand and inservice education on the other. They are not synonymous! The former is higher education, while the latter is post-secondary education. It is quite appropriate for teacher education to be involved in both, but a clear distinction must be made and communicated to the public. High-quality graduate teacher education involves scholarly pursuits, in-depth educational research, and intensive study of the discipline. Inservice education should be a high-quality experience, but of an entirely different nature. To combine the two serves only to dilute both. It would seem highly desirable for an organization such as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) to attempt a careful study of this proposition. To preserve our role in both, we need to provide the definitions, instead of having definitions provided for us. Such an undertaking would enhance rather than endanger the relationship between graduate teacher education and the "profession." Also, there is good reason to believe that such a move would enhance graduate teacher education programs and their overall status within their own institutions.

2. Graduate teacher education must carefully examine the bases on which programming occurs. Are programs devised or modified for

political, financial, or educational reasons? We can take little solace from the fact that we are where we are in many instances because we've attempted to be "responsive." The foundation on which graduate teacher education rests must be sound and translatable educational research.

The preservation of scholarly graduate programs in teacher education is perhaps the single most important factor in our ability to forestall the takeover of all professional preparation beyond the bachelor's degree. These are the only programs the professional associations have not claimed as being within their "capability domain" to deliver as well as, or better than, institutions of higher education. These programs, then, must not be manipulated by extraneous political or economic factors, but managed instead by sound academic planning. High-quality inservice programs and other continuing education activities are the appropriate vehicles for responding to the political and economic pressures existing in today's institutions of higher education.

Finally, graduate programs that are changed or modified either in substance or method of delivery because of perceived societal demand should be reexamined. Perhaps what is really needed is an infinitely better communications system about our programs--which themselves need to be thoroughly understood by their creators--rather than constant modification based on others' perceptions of what these programs should be.

3. *Graduate teacher education programs should reflect a pro-active rather than reactive posture.* Programs must give evidence of being ahead of the profession itself; advanced preparation should be just that! From such programs should come individuals exceedingly well grounded in the basics with expanded knowledge for shaping the future of education. We must educate individuals who are not confined to the *what is* but instead can confront the *what should be*, or even *what must be*, issues for education in the future. Our profession needs graduate programs to which it can turn for more than it now has.

   Graduate teacher education should be where new and better models for education are developed and tested. Intense, creative efforts should be required of all involved, graduate students as well as faculty, to extend our knowledge of education beyond that of today; the *leadership* necessary to plot the future of education effectively should emanate from those who have successfully completed our graduate teacher education programs.

4. *The future status of graduate teacher education will depend in large measure on effective programs of faculty reorientation--faculty development, if you will.* Such programs, using some of the "best" minds available, are critical to restoring the essence of graduate-level education. Restructuring a solid support system for faculty members by building a network of communicating professionals is perhaps the most effective and efficient way to accomplish this.

   A large-scale effort at establishing regional, state, and national seminars for the purpose of redefining graduate teacher education would be highly desirable--maybe even essential to the task. These should include colleagues from other appropriate and related disciplines. And, while it may be heresy to suggest it, the seminars should be limited to those in higher education. Such an undertaking could be mounted through the existing structure of AACTE with or without additional outside funding.

5. Flexible reward systems must be designed and implemented in higher education if we are planning to fulfill realistically the roles being forced upon us. This flexible approach must be designed in such a way that charges of elitism are not leveled at institutions that try it. Yet it is reasonable to expect that role requirements should be defined more precisely and appropriate rewards be assigned to these differing expectations; we cannot expect each faculty member to be all things to all people for all time.

   Differentiated career patterns need to be clearly defined and communicated to persons entering the broad field of teacher education. New or renewed classifications of clinical professorships, lecturers, part-time assignments, or joint appointments of various types should be investigated and tried. The expectation that all who enter higher education will excel as teachers and researchers, and have a long, distinguished list of publications and public service accomplishments as well, is an unrealistic view of individual differences and competencies.

6. Higher education in general and graduate teacher education in particular need to reconvince the general public and various pressure groups of the merit of a university as a relatively objective environment for studying various disciplines, not in a vacuum but in a detached setting. The notion of the "ivory tower" as necessarily negative must be dispelled. We must communicate to our various publics that we are engaged in the attempt to find solutions or problems that have universal application. While we are criticized for not knowing how to solve specific problems, we must convince our potential clientele of the merit in investigating discrete elements of problem solving and preparing students to meet a complexity of problem situations.

   Institutions of higher education are being asked more and more to design programs that are job specific and career oriented. Again, we are faced with a situation in which forces outside the university are determining what the various programs should look like. Instead of preparing education personnel for a wide variety of career options and letting them apply their learning abilities to job-specific tasks, we have allowed the job-specific tasks to determine the educational programs. Graduate teacher education should take place in an environment relatively free from the vicissitudes of the most recent education fads, political demands, or supply and demand surveys that are relentlessly beating at our doors.

The future of graduate programs in teacher education can be viewed in a pessimistic light. Certainly, we do have concerns and pressures that could cause us to lament our fate. There is, however, a brighter side to the issues we have discussed thus far. There has never been a golden age of graduate teacher education during which all problems were solved as soon as they appeared. Professional education study has continually provided meaningful challenges for those involved in this important work. Let each of us look upon these issues and concerns as a spur to action which will result in the preparation of far-reaching, insightful professionals who can and will approach the future with confidence.

WHEN IGNORANT ARMIES CLASH BY NIGHT[1]

Ira J. Gordon

IN MEMORIAM. Dr. Ira J. Gordon died last fall of an apparent heart attack at the age of 55. When stricken, he had been serving as Dean of the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill for just over a year. Previously he had been Director of the Institute for Development of Human Resources at the University of Florida.

A recognized authority on early childhood and parent education and development, Dr. Gordon had established a reputation as a researcher, consultant, and author. Just before his death, he had agreed to contribute to this collection, and had drafted the paper that appears here. His assistant Mary Wetherby completed the task and submitted the manuscript for publication.

The Clearinghouse is fortunate to be able to include the chapter, one of the last manuscripts by this renowned educator.

--The Clearinghouse

The title of this chapter has been deliberately chosen to reflect the confusion and disarray that some feel about the status of teacher education in the United States. It was also chosen to reflect that not only are there conflicts, but many of the conflicts arise because of ignorance--for example, inadequate scientific and practical information about social organizations or the teaching-learning process; ignorance of agencies about one another; or lack of knowledge, on the part of people within various groups, about their role and responsibility.

A SYSTEMS OVERVIEW

From a systems perspective, it is clear that the graduate school of education (GSE) is not an independent entity determining its own goals, operations, and resources. It fits within a campus, whether that campus be a major research university such as the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill or an institution primarily dedicated to undergraduate education but with a small graduate program. The smallest system--the microsystem--is the campus, which includes the GSE, other departments, administrative units, and the like. There are roles and relationships, goals and expectations, and history which influence how the partners in that central unit relate to and affect each other.

The next system surrounding the campus consists of three major agencies: the State University System or State College Board to which the campus belongs in many states, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the local educational units. The third layer consists of state legislators, local and state media, and a local and state lay public. An outer layer consists of the federal and national norm groups, including the research community, the national professional teacher organizations, national school boards, national Parent Teacher Association, and the federal political system.

---

[1] From the poem, Dover Beach, by Matthew Arnold.

In order to address where we are, need to go, or are going in graduate education, we need to examine briefly the forces within the micro-system that influence decision making and the environmental pressures from outside the central system, and then attempt to make some resolution. This chapter will analyze these internal and external pressures that influence the behavior of the GSE and then will suggest some possible options for the future.

A personal disclaimer needs to be made at this point: I am relatively new to administration, having assumed the deanship in May 1977, and I come from a research orientation based essentially in the field of human development. I have previous experience as a department chairperson and as director of a research institute.

FORCES WITHIN THE MICRO-SYSTEM

Within the system, decreased enrollment in both undergraduate and graduate courses--not just during the academic year, but particularly noticeable in summer sessions--is perceived as a major pressure. Since an academic unit characteristically is allotted faculty positions in some proportion to the number of students the unit serves, this decrease in enrollment threatens not only nontenured faculty members but also the program of the unit. If there is little turnover or even a decrease in faculty personnel, then impetus for change, the infusion of new blood, and all of the other consequences of static or declining resources move from perception to reality. Great effort is expended to preserve one's job--to hold on to existing territory and maintain existing organization.

GSEs, as well as all other organizations, suffer from a form of Parkinsonism. This term derives from Parkinson's Law that organizations will expend their energy in maintaining themselves as they are or in increasingly bureaucratizing themselves. They spend their energies not in program but in maintenance. Decreased enrollments operate to accelerate this process and to foster a "circle the wagons" mentality.

Since most institutions were experiencing rapid growth until the past few years, we can see generational conflict within the faculty itself. The norms of older faculty members are oriented toward teaching and campus service, with some elements of responsiveness to teachers in the field. The older generation also fits comfortably into a state's "old boy" network since many of their graduates are now in important positions of leadership throughout the state public school system. The tendency is to operate on personal bases and teach from old views of the classroom and certainly not to engage in research. That, at least in caricature, is the perception held by the generation hired from the late sixties into the middle seventies.

This group of younger faculty members also can be caricatured: they are seen as having highly individualistic goals and a "careerist" attitude; that is, they have neither a strong allegiance to the institution that pays them nor a sense of professional obligation to any norm group in the professional or scientific domain. Their goals are personal achievement and grandeur, and they take any opportunistic route to achieve these goals. In effect they are saying, "If the organization doesn't know where it is going, I might as well advance myself and use the system to suit my purpose." This type of thinking is a form of individual self-protection against an irrational system. They seek enhancement through research, publication, or presentations at meetings, but what they research and publish does not necessarily have a longitudinal programmatic thrust. If they seek grants, they go where the money is rather than first determining what they wish to do. Thus, in goals and attitudes about teaching, service, and research--the three clearcut goals of any GSE--the younger faculty members are quite different from their elders. This generational conflict spills over into subdiscipline conflict, since very often the elders are in administration and in curriculm and instruction, while the youngsters are in what used to be more peripheral fields of counseling, special education, school psychology, and the like.

Another force at play is the fact that schools of education generally occupy a relatively low status on the campus. Thus, those who wish to "make it" attempt to emulate behavior of those who are perceived as having high status. The tendency is to assume that the liberal arts model of graduate education and scientific research is the appropriate way to raise the status of the school and, thus, one's own status as a member of an education faculty.

A common source of difficulty is the conflicting role expectations for GSE faculty members. On the one hand, they are expected to relate as peers to teachers in the field and serve in a variety of ways requiring particular types of preparation, travel, and time. On the other hand, they are aware of the traditional university viewpoint about appropriate behavior leading to tenure and promotion; they perceive the reward system in the university as an obstacle to the field service commitment of professionals in education. From my perspective, this is more an excuse than a reality, but nevertheless the perception is firmly entrenched.

All institutions go through cycles of centripetal and centrifugal periods; at times they move toward strong centralization, and at other times they move toward high levels of decentralization. Schools of education seem to be at different phases in this cycle; and sometimes, both movements are occurring simultaneously. While some programs (undergraduate teacher education, perhaps) are becoming more centralized, others are moving in the opposite direction; for example, many seem to be decentralizing the doctoral program by strengthening the control of the doctoral committee as is common in the arts and sciences. This change raises fundamental questions about the differences between a graduate school in the arts and sciences and a professional graduate school. It has certainly led to the decline in importance of Foundations experiences, especially in what used to be the jewel of the Foundations; that is, history, philosophy, and social roots of education. Psychology manages to make its way because of its emphasis on research and its control, to date, of the major research and evaluation models. But as schools move to increase specialization, the common training of those who will possess an education degree tends to decrease; consequently, the interchange among doctoral students representing different subdisciplines within the field suffers. And membership in the ignorant armies swells as a result.

All fields suffer from fads and fancies, but fields with a heavy practitioner orientation and without a sound, well-accepted, scientific knowledge base are more likely to follow such fads. Education is obviously not immune, and indeed is a prime example of "bandwagon" activity. Not all of these fads originate within the micro-system, however; in fact, most of them do not. Within the system, those who resist the fad because they believe it to be a fad, and know that if they can resist for a few years it will go away, are ranged against those who see the fad as an opportunity for personal advancement or enhancement and, of course, those who are the true believers. Some see competency-based teacher education as such a fad; others feel the emphasis on field approaches is yet another one.

Opportunism vs. Planning

Another way of looking at some of these ideas, so that each category is not seen as a distinct element, is to analyze the issue as representing the tension of opportunism versus planning. It sometimes seems that academic units develop by a pseudopod approach: they resemble the amoeba--first one foot is extended, then the whole amoeba follows. Some person or group gets an idea, somehow is successful in eliciting funds, begins a program, then gradually shapes the direction of considerable school energies to carry out what was not an agreed-upon plan developed across the board by faculty members. No doubt this is a time-honored and probably very successful procedure. It reflects beliefs in academic freedom, individual initiative, and all of those good things, but it also reflects a certain degree of anarchy in program planning. Although plans should never cut off opportunities, neither should programs be developed simply in response to an attractive lure, especially of dollars from some force external to the school.

The micro-system includes more than the GSE. It includes the whole campus. My preceding comments have referred to forces within the School of Education, but other subsystems within the micro-system also need to be addressed. Obviously, the College of Liberal Arts plays a considerable role in the undergraduate preparation of teachers, in provision of both general education and subject matter training. It is not clear how large a role that College should play in graduate education. The differences between its orientation and that of the School of Education may create a variety of tensions in program development. Departments within the College of Liberal Arts, such as psychology and sociology, have professional training groups as well. On a large university campus, other professional schools also are engaged in training people who will either work in the public schools or serve in agencies that have educational missions. Schools of social work, medicine, dentistry, allied health, and public health all are training educators in some fashion. If a School of Education adopts the notion that its mission extends beyond the training of personnel for the public school system and attempts to train people for any organization with an educational mission, the old turf struggles become revitalized. These struggles become especially evident as other agencies from off campus fund nutrition education programs, training for group home workers, day care and child care activities, community mental health centers, and the like.

In sum, a variety of internal pressures and forces within a graduate school of education and its campus influence its ability to develop a clear mission and self-perception and then to carry out appropriate activities.

PRESSURES FROM OUTSIDE THE MICRO-SYSTEM

The first set of pressures comes from the system immediately surrounding the campus; that is, the State University System, the State Department of Public Instruction, the local education agencies, and the state teacher organizations and other interest group organizations, such as the PTA and the American Association of Retired Persons.

State University System. The move in many states to consolidated universities considerably decreases certain elements of local control at the campus level and at the GSE level. A state university system tends to seek uniformity in all of its units; it has difficulty supporting the notion that one unit may have a special mission, a special student body, or a different funding pattern. Much lip service is given to support of the oldest and more prestigious units in the system--the Berkeleys and UCLAs and Chapel Hills and Urbanas. However, funds are spread across all units and there is sooner or later a search to eliminate duplication, an attempt at some common numbering of courses. Courses should be the same, programs should be the same, students who enter them should be the same and should emerge looking alike. The notion works in the factory system--a car produced in Detroit should not function differently from a car produced in McKeesport, Pennsylvania. People in academia obviously resist such notions. They recognize the total unreality, indeed the destructiveness, of such views. They believe firmly that different schools can and should have different missions, that different student bodies can and should be served in different ways, and that funding should be a function not simply of head counts but of missions as well.

In addition, the central administrations of state university systems behave as all bureaucracies do: they increase their numbers and then attempt to extend their influence and interfere with the operations of the separate units. Their tendency is to move past their original mission of injecting some elements of coordination, and into control and dictation. Since the central units allocate the dollars, the old slogan that "power goes where the dollars go" has a certain validity, even in these days of cheap dollars. Thus a school's mission is influenced from outside by the desires, philosophy, and viewpoints of staff members of a board of regents.

The State Department of Public Instruction. Obviously, state departments of public instruction always play key roles in teacher education since they are the accrediting agencies. They provide one of the reviews for determining whether the School of Education can turn out accredited professionals. But SDPIs recently have moved more strongly into inservice training and are often competing with graduate schools of education that are developing field-oriented programs. Further, the extensive staff development opportunities and experiences provided throughout the year by state departments of education to teachers in local systems have no doubt contributed substantially to the decline of summer school enrollments. Third, funding patterns now are placing more and more federal funds in the hands of state department personnel, not only in public instruction but also in human resources, health, and other areas which relate to graduate training. Fourth, through legislative pressure or public demand, more and more mission-oriented and hands-on, short-term, practical programs are being adopted. State department funds for these programs tend to help shape the graduate education program by offering inducements for schools to seek such funds, and thus to do tasks that may not always be relevant to primary missions.

The Local Education Agencies. LEAs, not only as the immediate consumers of the products of GSEs but also as consumers of field services, play a major role--and I hope an increasingly major role--in influencing GSE programs. Typically, however, field services have been offered through either organized field services bureau extension courses or private consulting to respond to perceived needs of LEAs. Most of these perceived needs are of a very practical nature, and very real. However, while the fireman-consultant responding to individual alarms may be somewhat successful in putting out the fires, he or she never develops any models or treatable program elements, and certainly does not generate research. For schools of education to support, either formally or informally, the fireman-consultant role may be counterproductive to systematic LEA and GSE program development.

An emerging force in the LEA is the teacher organization, whose strength is fostered by federal teacher center legislation. There is a degree of tension within the LEA and between the LEA and the GSE about the role of teacher organizations in inservice and preservice education. No one is the villain. People in each of these agencies operate with good will, but very often the SUS, SDPI, LEA, and GSE are not communicating effectively with each other and are working at cross-purposes.

The State Legislature. Since education is a responsibility of the state, state legislatures have--and increasingly are using--the power to set directions for the substance of education and the measurement of program effects. The accountability movement and competency testing, now in at least 33 states, are indicative of this legislative power. Further, many legislatures adopt acts to establish what course should be taught in teacher education; thus, for example, we are legislatively mandated to offer a reading course for secondary school teachers. On the one hand, it is fine that legislators are concerned about reading. However, such an intrusion into what has been for centuries the particular domain of higher education reflects the weakness of the professional school and the view of teacher education as quite different from education for other fields bearing the label "professional."

One cannot imagine a state legislature requiring the School of Medicine to offer a specific course in neuro-anatomy or physical therapy, or the Law School to offer a special course in the presentation of trial briefs. This highly permeable barrier around the School of Education presents distinct problems, whereas other campus units are more able to control their own fields and fates. In addition, state legislation promulgating initiatives for a host of concerns--community schools, early childhood education, "back to the basics," requirements for driver education and nutrition education and consumer education and parent education, ad infinitum, for the high schools--indirectly shapes not only undergraduate training programs but those in the graduate school of education as well.

Federal Legislation. Any administrator of a school of education knows well the role of the federal government. In many cases half the school's budget derives from federal funds, either directly or indirectly through state sources. The federal teacher center legislation, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142), the Education Professions Development Act (EDPA), and all the numbers and letters impact program decision making in the GSE.

But the role of the federal government transcends training programs. The general movement, in both federal legislation and the bureaucracies, toward mission-oriented contract research has profound effects on graduate schools of education. I believe strongly that good research originates in the mind and heart of the individual researcher or in the informal network of a group of collaborators. Becoming a good researcher takes time and requires small successes either as a participant in some programmatic effort or in the development of one's own long-term research thrust. For universities to take the route of response to "Requests for Proposals" (RFPs) from government agencies virtually kills off the development of young investigators, whose chances of securing even small amounts of funds to begin their research careers are virtually nil. The opportunities for ingenuity, for discovery of new research areas, for creativity, do not exist in an RFP framework. Furthermore, the nature of the university itself makes rapid response to RFPs an extremely difficult task logistically.

In addition, the RFP route presents major problems philosophically: control of research often rests in the hands of people who have never conducted research themselves; who have no understanding of research norms or the needs for basic research; and who, because they are far removed from the field, have no understanding of the realities of conducting research in an education setting, as distinct from some laboratory or textbook model. Further, the topics chosen for study and the way RFPs require one to study them suborn the true research process. We will pay for years in staff development and in products of knowledge for this unfortunate movement to mission-oriented RFPs.

Other Pressures. Norm groups are also part of the larger system that brings pressures on the School of Education. The educational research and evaluation community itself, the scientific and professional community, the community of scholars, all should obviously play a fundamental role in influencing GSE programs. In the best of all possible worlds, all members of the GSE faculty are part of this community.

Meetings, journals, and informal network arrangements should continuously alert faculty members to new knowledge and the latest strategies. Were we truly a community, the number of fads and fancies might be decreased, and there might also be strength enough to resist some of the pressures from outside forces. Today, there is disappointment and disagreement over program evaluation, over the utility of such ideas as competency-based teacher education; but I also see a lack of any fundamental programmatic research in curriculum development. It is as though the efforts of the 1950s have spun themselves out and nobody has either the energy or the heart to move past them.

Research on teaching also is a chaotic field. We lack any sense of direction in our research and evaluation efforts. To some degree, the lack of a grand design may be good, since I place my faith in the individual researcher. Nevertheless, if there is no set of general theories, if the work of individual researchers doesn't relate to that of others and doesn't begin to build some sort of common knowledge base, then we are simply tinkering instead of moving toward a science of education.

Where does this leave us? Within each system and across systems, there are tensions and problems. No group has a clear view. Our situation can be summed up by other lines from Arnold's poem: "and we are here as on a darkling plain, swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight."[2]

---

[2] Ibid.

POSSIBLE OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

This section presents possible options which are currently being explored at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. These ideas may have little or much generalizability to the field, but they represent both process and substance of how a faculty in a School of Education can approach the problems described earlier and attempt to redefine or restate its view of its role in graduate education.

The UNC-CH School of Education is a relatively small school, particularly for one located at a major research university. Its size offers the advantage of facilitating interpersonal communication but the disadvantage of limiting resources in certain areas. Traditionally the School, like many of its counterparts, had a larger undergraduate than graduate enrollment and perceived its primary role as undergraduate teacher education. The time of many faculty members was consumed totally by undergraduate programs, at least to the extent that their attention to graduate programs was a peripheral or overload effort. Responses to the field combined some high-level, well-done, systematic efforts; some individual consulting; and a number of extension courses. Not only was no research planned, but virtually no funded research was being conducted; the main pattern of research was via doctoral dissertations.

The School is organized in four divisions: Curriculum and Instruction, Human Development and Psychological Services, Organizational Development and Institutional Studies, and Special Education. This divisional structure is fairly new. As of July 1977, undergraduate teacher education was not centralized in any fashion but was rather a joint responsibility across three divisions, although program elements were integrated by committees and reports and in other informal ways. Responsibility for training prospective high school teachers rested not only with the School but with departments in the College of Liberal Arts--notably in speech, music, art, and foreign languages, areas in which the School of Education had no teacher education faculty positions.

Our first task was the development of program priorities within each division. We began at the division level, but then used several interdivisional faculty committees to develop a restatement schoolwide of our roles in graduate education. We have taken into account the variety of pressures mentioned earlier and have recently emerged with a redefined view of ourselves and some concrete plans for implementation.

From my perspective, the process is as important as the substance; that is, until the members of a school of education faculty can perceive some common missions and can develop a sense of professional identity, professional pride, and belief in themselves and their organizations, nothing much will happen. Just as we believe self-concept is an important element in individual achievement, so also are faculty self-concept and the institution's self-concept vital elements in their ability to achieve. One step, to which I alluded earlier, is to define the differences between a Graduate School of Education as a professional school and the missions of departments in a School of Liberal Arts.

I have used as a model the view offered by Simon (1969), that in the university setting it is the task of the academic and scientific disciplines to describe how things are and how they work. It has been the task of professional schools to teach how to design and make things and, from this perspective, Schools of Education are engineering schools. But according to Simon, "Engineering schools have become schools of physics and mathematics; medical schools have become schools of biological sciences; business schools have become schools of finite mathematics. The use of adjectives like 'applied' conceals, but does not change, the fact" (p. 56).

This is happening in education, too: "Education schools have attempted to become schools of behavioral science, reading research has become the study of psycholinguistics, curriculum research has become the investigation of cognitive psychology (Piaget), instructional research the investigation of operant principles. Faculties in schools of education attempt to become describers rather than designers" (Gordon, 1978, p. 2). Thus we need to address the questions: What do we do as designers rather than describers? How in our priorities for program development, how within our courses, how in our relations with our peers in the field, do we behave from a design rather than a description orientation?

We have of course not resolved this issue, nor even fully addressed it. But I believe it is an important distinction that graduate schools of education need to address. We should seek our legitimacy through high-quality, rigorously intellectual endeavors in the design field, and not attempt to emulate the descriptive sciences. In the past, as I have worked with many graduate students designing their dissertations, I have been discouraged that students in curriculum and instruction try to do dissertations in developmental psychology. Even students in educational psychology do the same thing. It is not that we are not capable of such study, but that it is not appropriate. We have so many unsolved problems in the delivery of good instruction and in the measurement of both learners and the learning setting that we should devote our energies to these issues rather than to fundamental learning processes or the chemical composition of the brain.

From this often unstated position has come our divisional and now our school self-concept. Like all self-concepts, it is not fully integrated; some aspects of self are at the perceptual level, other aspects are peripheral and easily subject to change, and the deep inner core is probably more private than public. Nevertheless, this first step gives us additional options to examine and makes public a view for open communication. What follows are excerpts from our statement:

> The primary function of the School of Education is to serve the needs of the people of the State of North Carolina in the setting of a doctoral research institution. . . . A number of factors were examined in the arrival at the present statement to accomplish that mission. An examination of major professional issues, current professional and scientific literature, existing and potential resources, the governments' (state and federal) views as reflected in legislation, all contributed to our thinking. It is essential, as educators of professionals, that we prepare people who provide the best learning environments and experiences for students of all ages. The measurement of effectiveness, and its implications for program development and teacher education, are of major concern. . . . [What is required is] not only that school people understand what . . . tests measure and be able to interpret them . . . but also that schools develop new curriculum and instruction efforts to enable those pupils who are doing poorly in the early years or fail the competency test at grade 11 to receive training to enable them to graduate from high school with an acceptable degree of functional literacy. . . . There is considerable unhappiness in the profession and the scientific field itself with

> current research methodological problems for program evaluation. At the same time, this area is one of great ambiguity. In a School devoted to field collaborative efforts, opportunities abound for the contribution to scientific knowledge and practical utilization of various approaches to program evaluation using sociological and anthropological perspectives as well as psychological and psychometric designs (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978, pp. 1, 2).

In addition, we discussed the impact of Special Education legislation, basic skills, and reading programs, and stated:

> Although reading has been seen as the key to further development of ideas, in today's world, information is gained through the other media as well as from print. . . . This requires that literacy be more broadly defined to include all forms of communication and means of acquiring information. We must upgrade the capabilities of the school system to make pupils truly literate in this larger sense (p. 3).

The movement of schools of education into areas that were formerly identified with other professional schools or disciplines was mentioned in the first section of this paper:

> We recognize there are changing concepts of education and the roles of Schools of Education. In the professional and scientific domains, the nature of other social agencies, and their relationships to education, and the relationships of various educational agencies, are in a state of flux. There is an increased awareness of the role of the family and society in personal as well as intellectual development. Other professionals who are narrowly trained in clinical fashion need reeducation to perform teaching roles. For example, clinical psychologists in community mental health centers, social workers, and members of the health professions are all engaged in a variety of educational pursuits which require them to be reeducated.
>
> We now recognize that education begins long before formal schooling and lasts throughout life. This imposes upon a School of Education responsibilities to examine its role and contribution to informal or nonformal educational agencies such as the family, the neighborhood, day care centers, homes for the elderly. It requires collaboration with other professionals (p. 3).

In the mission statement, we have addressed such emerging issues as changes in governance, the role of lay personnel and parents in the education of their children, and the relationships of teacher organizations to inservice education, as well as issues of civil rights and individual rights to education. The statement itself attempts to integrate research, on-campus graduate education, and field-based efforts in collaboration not only with school systems but with all other agencies concerned with learning and development:

> The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has been designated by the Board of Governors as a doctoral research institution. In keeping with this designation, the School of Education seeks to integrate research, teaching, and service into a system to meet the needs

identified in the rationale, and to meet emerging needs of the state, region, and nation in years to come.

Research ideas originate in the mind and heart of a single investigator rather than in committees or at divisional faculty meetings. Therefore, the School of Education has no specific research topics that can be called its mission. However, it is expected that faculty, together with graduate and undergraduate students and interested professionals in the field, will be constantly engaged in research designed to enhance our understanding of the teaching-learning process, the nature of schools and schooling, the relationships among agencies responsible for the education of the child, the development of intellect and personality, the analysis of curriculum programs, and the design of teacher education. Since most questions in education are complex and include the analysis of many variables, the school encourages collaborative efforts in the natural setting over the role of the single investigator in the laboratory. It also requires, therefore, that graduate students have a considerable understanding of multivariate procedures and analyses so that they can create, design, and participate in educational investigation. We see the conduct of research as closely related to the education of students and the performance of collaborative missions with school systems and other agencies concerned with the growth and development of people (p. 6).

The School of Education sees as its primary teaching mission the education of educational leaders at the doctoral level to serve the state, region, and the nation. This effort is accomplished through programs in the four divisions of the school and through considerable interdivisional and schoolwide activities.

The academic programs . . . are all designed to include considerable field experience in practicums and internships in the schools and agencies which are involved in collaborative staff development and research efforts with the School. Thus the academic program is integrated into the general mission of teaching, research, and service and is not purely a campus classroom activity.

Many of the experiences provided to graduate students are designed from an interdivisional perspective. All Ph.D. students take a common core of research design and statistics courses, and participate as apprentices in the field research program of the school. Faculty are expected to play service roles for students across divisions as well as fundamental roles in the undergraduate program and in the field efforts . . . (p. 7).

In addition to the divisional structure, several interdivisional committees are involved in program development in areas such as research training, training of professionals whose primary field is not education, and in examination of the relationships between education, the family, the community, and the service delivery systems. Parent education and parent involvement are important features of the interdivisional program effort . . . (p. 9).

It is obvious from the above that a central thrust of the School is relating to those in the field carrying out the daily activities of education in its many settings, including schools from nursery through graduate school, social agencies and institutions, and the home. The School has both a responsive and initiative stance toward these agencies. It is engaged, and seeks to engage, in collaborative endeavors of a long term nature with them on problems identified as being of

> mutual interest. These activities include the design of programs that include local staff development as well as internship and practicum experiences for students, and the conduct of research that leads to generalized information which can be of service to all agencies engaged in education, broadly conceived. The School has close ties to consortia of school districts, as well as to single school districts and to various state agencies and state institutions where children and youth are served (p. 10).

CONCLUSIONS

I am not saying that the procedures we have used, which fit our place within our own system and respond to the history of the school and the institution, can or should be generalized. What I am suggesting is that the faculty members and administrators concerned with the questions "Where are we?" and "Where should we be going?" adopt an analytic framework. I feel the systems approach is most useful to examine the pressures that apply in a particular situation, especially the faculty's own professional perceptions, goals, and resources, and to arrive at a solution appropriate to that school as well as to the needs of the systems to which it belongs. They might also ask: "What is it that we can do in this institution that is not easily replicable in a sister institution? What is it they are doing so well, that we should no longer do?" We need to abandon our defensive stance and aggressively seek restatement and redefinition.

Graduate schools of education, I believe, have a fundamental and continuous role to play, but we need to engage in very serious, difficult, and sometimes traumatic self-exploration, and put forth our concept of ourselves rather than be governed by external perceptions of us. How a school does this may be highly individualistic, but I believe the process is essential for all. It may not end the clash, but it might decrease the ignorance of the armies and move the struggle into the daylight.

REFERENCES

Gordon, I. J. "New Look at Problems of Instruction." Lecture at Auburn University School of Education, Educator-in-Residence, Auburn, Ala., July 19-21, 1978.

Simon, H. The Sciences of the Artificial. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1969.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, School of Education. "Draft of Mission Statement." June 15, 1978.

48

GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION: RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION

James M. Cooper and Wilford A. Weber

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching expressed the belief that "no effort to improve the schools in America is likely to succeed until substantial progress is made in improving the professional education of teachers and the valid knowledge base upon which it rests" (Howsam, 1976, p. 14). The view here is that improvement of the professional education of teachers is best accomplished through graduate teacher education programs.

The programs described in this chapter represent a portion of one institution's efforts to improve professional education for teachers in this regard. In discussing three of the University of Houston's graduate teacher education programs--the School-Based Teacher Education Program, the Master of Education in Teaching Degree Program, and the Doctor of Education in Teacher Education Degree Program--we will examine the institutional context in which each was developed and the professional needs to which each was responding.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

As with so many institutions of higher education, the University of Houston has experienced declining enrollments in the undergraduate teacher education program. For example, in 1975 the College of Education graduated 1380 B.S. students, while in 1978 it graduated only 483. Fortunately, the decline has had some positive effects. First, in past years the large number of undergraduate students impeded the full and effective implementation of the undergraduate competency-based teacher education program. The smaller undergraduate enrollment has made development and operation of the CBTE program much more manageable while enhancing research and evaluation efforts. Second, the decreasing number of undergraduates has caused the College of Education to work harder to attract graduate students. In 1978 the College graduated 356 M.Ed. and 58 Ed.D. students; these figures are comparable with those from past years.

In addition, the state of Texas funds graduate education at a higher rate than undergraduate education. The ratio for Education is approximately 1:3:9 for undergraduate, master's, and doctoral credit hours generated; that is, a doctoral student earns the institution three times as much money per credit hour as a master's student and nine times as much as an undergraduate student. Thus, it is financially advantageous in Texas for a public institution of higher education to focus more attention on graduate education. This unique formula funding in Texas offers tremendous opportunities for financing graduate education without having to cope with overwhelming numbers of students.

Two years ago, the central campus of the University of Houston completed a mission self-study in preparation for an accreditation visit by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. From that mission self-study emerged the notion that the central campus should serve as a flagship of the University of Houston system (which includes three other campuses), and should gradually increase the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students. As an attraction for teaching graduate students, the University initiated a policy that equates the teaching of three undergraduate classes to the teaching of two graduate classes when computing teaching load. This policy effectively communicates the University's esteem for graduate education.

In conjunction with the self-study, the faculty of the College of Education reaffirmed its goals and objectives as a professional school. Three of these goals are: (a) to prepare well-qualified personnel for service in educational systems and agencies through both preservice and inservice programs; (b) to contribute, through scholarly activities including basic and applied research, to the knowledge base on which the practice of that profession rests; and (c) to attempt continually to improve teacher education through innovative and experimental programs. Without strong graduate programs in teacher education, these goals cannot be met.

One can see that institutional incentives and processes operate to encourage strong graduate teacher education programs. However, while it is true that graduate programs are impacted by institutional realities, it is equally true that they must attempt to respond to the perceived needs of the teaching profession.

PROFESSIONAL NEEDS

The graduate teacher education programs described here represent efforts to respond to the needs of the teaching profession. While each is intended to meet a somewhat different set of needs, all attempt to address: (a) the need for training beyond that provided at the undergraduate level; (b) the need for training that is relevant and job-related; and (c) the need for training that provides teachers and teacher educators with expertise as instructional specialists.

Teacher education may be viewed as a preservice-inservice continuum. It can be argued that undergraduate teacher preparation programs do not provide sufficient life space to incorporate all that is necessary to produce a fully prepared teacher. As a result, those who complete undergraduate teacher education programs experience a "preservice deficit"--they lack much of the knowledge and many of the skills needed to be effective teachers. Graduate programs are a means of increasing the teacher education life space and providing sorely needed training that teachers did not, and could not, receive as undergraduates.

One could also argue that certain types of training have little benefit for preservice teachers--teachers who have not taught. Graduate programs can provide the kinds of training that would have maximum benefit for inservice teachers--teachers who have taught. As noted by Fuller and Bown (1975), the experience base of inservice teachers may be such that it allows them to profit from training experiences that undergraduate teacher education students might not find beneficial.

The training provided by undergraduate teacher education programs is not, and cannot be, job specific; the undergraduate student is trained for a very general role. Only graduate teacher education programs can respond to the job-specific needs of the inservice teacher. They must help teachers acquire and demonstrate those competencies which teachers themselves feel they need, and which are required by the specific professional roles teachers play in their schools. This is best accomplished by involving--as equal partners--representatives of the teaching profession and the schools in the design, operation, and evaluation of teacher education programs. Graduate programs can be a vehicle for this collaborative effort.

Teachers, and teacher educators, are often trained as specialists in a particular subject matter field--reading, mathematics, science, and so forth. Few acquire expertise as instructional specialists--persons with expertise in the instructional process. Graduate teacher education programs can provide teachers with opportunities to acquire and demonstrate competence as instructional specialists.

Finally, there is a need for a cadre of qualified school-based teacher educators who are intimately involved in the clinical training of both preservice teacher education students and inservice teachers, as well as a need for campus-based teacher educators who have expertise in instructional processes. Graduate programs can be designed to prepare qualified school-based and campus-based teacher educators.

SCHOOL-BASED TEACHER EDUCATOR PROGRAM

The Need

Educators have always been concerned about the need to improve teacher effectiveness, but that need has greatly increased in recent years because of changes in society and deficiencies in initial teacher training programs. Deficiencies also arise as teachers advance to new teaching roles requiring knowledge and skills lacking in their initial training, but essential for effectiveness in those new roles. The increasing need to improve teacher effectiveness is commensurate with our rapidly changing times that have produced: (a) a need for new emphases in education, and hence in teaching; (b) new teaching knowledge and skills; and (c) new systems for training teachers. The use of such terms as "educational reform" and "teacher renewal" in teacher education literature are indicative of the need for change. Corrigan (1974, p. 105) stated that:

> The teachers now in the schools who are forty to forty-five years old and have twenty to twenty-five years of teaching left are "career teachers." Unless we reeducate them right along with the new teachers, the schools will not improve significantly.

The impact of our increasingly dynamic society forces us to realize that no teacher can long maintain an effective teaching career with only the initial level of professional training in the knowledge and skills of teaching.

Cogan (1975) reminded us that the established professions require practitioners to continue their education throughout their entire professional life to gain new knowledge and competencies, so that they will not lapse into professional obsolescence. Considering the conservative nature of the educational institution and the inadequacy of preservice education, Cogan concluded that teachers, unless given continuous onsite training, will fall into the obsolescence trap rather early in their careers. Furthermore, considering the sporadic nature of efforts at educational renewal and the increasing knowledge of what constitutes teacher effectiveness, it would be unrealistic to assume that the obsolescence trap is empty at this time. The need for continuous teacher education becomes more apparent as recent research provides evidence on effective teaching procedures. Dunkin and Biddle (1974, p. 418) stated that:

> At long last we are beginning to know what is actually going on in the classroom, as well as what produces and results from classroom events. Surely the appearance of this research effort is one of the most significant developments in education during the twentieth century.

How can classroom teachers keep informed of such significant developments in education? Corrigan (1974) saw a need for trained professionals who will work not only with children and youth, but with teachers as well. He alluded to a new kind of specialist who will work within a teaching team as a demonstration teacher, interpreting what research means for learning and instruction. This specialist, whom Corrigan saw as an agent for the effective utilization of research results, could help teachers avoid becoming obsolete in their profession.

Continuous teacher education is particularly vital for supervising teachers. That the supervising teacher is the single most important factor in determining the teaching behavior of the preservice teacher is well established (Tittle, 1974). The trend of teacher preparation institutions to increase the clinical aspects of their programs also enhances the role of the supervising teacher. In addition, competency-based programs demand more specific knowledge of teaching and learning processes. All these factors make it imperative that supervising teachers be both current and highly knowledgeable in effective teaching practices.

Continuous professional education for teachers will increase as societal change and research on teacher effectiveness produce new and more effective teaching and learning environments. Likewise, onsite or school-based teacher education will increase and the agent for this process will be the "specialist" or the "trained professional" described in current educational literature--identified here as the "school-based teacher educator."

The Program

Between 1975 and 1977, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education supported the development of the School Based Teacher Educator Project. Administered through the University of Houston Teacher Center, the project had two major goals:

1. To improve teacher education in Texas by developing (a) a set of competency specifications for the role of school-based teacher educator and (b) a prototype set of training materials for this role

2. To formulate a cooperative network among the Texas Teacher Centers for developing, training, and recognizing the competence of school-based teacher educators.

A school-based teacher educator (SBTE) is a professional who has responsibilities for preservice, inservice, and/or continuing teacher education, and whose primary base of operations is in the elementary or secondary school. With the increased participation of teachers in designing staff development programs and the emphasis on performance in actual classrooms, this role has grown in importance.

SBTE roles currently include supervisor of student teachers, team leader, instructional design specialist, inservice education coordinator, clinical professor, and intern consultant. These roles have a number of similar functions: the SBTE interacts with others about professional performance; demonstrates a knowledge of professional practices; and concurrently demonstrates, as a teacher, the behaviors he or she is assisting others to perform. The SBTE, in short, is a part-time or full-time staff development specialist.

Teacher Center Network

In 1973, the Texas State Board of Education instituted a mandatory teacher center organization for teacher education. Every preparation program in the state was required to seek advice on teacher education from its related teacher center. The center, in turn, was to be composed of representatives of (a) participating schools, (b) professional organizations, and (c) colleges or universities. Such an organization promotes interaction among the various education partners.

Although mandated, the system of teacher centering in Texas is still in the formative stages. Cooperative efforts have been more nominal than actual. Leadership often emanates from the college, but sometimes a school district (such as Dallas ISD) or regional educational service center (such as in the San Antonio area) organizes a center.

The new state standards did not allocate funds to support the centers, nor delineate specific ways for centers to organize and interact. The mission of the centers (other than to advise on new certification programs) was not considered. As a consequence, most centers have struggled to assess their needs and formulate goals and operating procedures.

Individual centers typically do not have the resources nor the expertise to specify competencies, test them, and design systematic and flexible education programs for school-based teacher educators. When training programs have been designed, they usually have been in the form of one-day workshops, procedures manuals, or lectures--activities not tied to competency specifications and not constituting an integrated training system.

In Fall 1975, each teacher center in the state was invited to send representatives to an organizational meeting, immediately preceding the Texas Education Agency's annual teacher education conference. More than 60 persons attended that first meeting of the SBTE Project in October in Fort Worth. The purpose of the conference was to disseminate information about project goals and objectives, proposed activities, and expected outcomes. Forty teacher centers subsequently joined the Network.

From the beginning of the program, each teacher center was designed to be the delivery system for training school-based teacher educators. Some of the centers, because of their association with universities, are able to offer SBTE training for graduate credit, while other teacher centers offer inservice credit. All written materials and training products developed while the program was underwritten by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education were distributed to all 40 participating teacher centers.

A major goal of the program was to develop a set of competency statements that would reflect the knowledge and skills an SBTE requires. A set of 20 competencies was prepared following an exhaustive process: an extensive literature review; interviews with persons in similar roles; concept papers on clinical practice; development of an initial list of competencies; review of that list by a national panel of 52 experts in instruction and instructional supervision; analysis of the national panel's recommendations by a competency identification task force; refinement of the list; a statewide survey of 300 teacher educators; and, finally, review and adoption of the revised list by representatives of the teacher centers in the Network.

Subsequently, more specific behavioral statements were derived from the 20 competencies, as were suggestions about evidence that might be used to determine whether the competencies had been demonstrated and possible criteria for judging the adequacy of the evidence. A self-assessment instrument was also developed to help SBTEs establish their own priorities for competency areas in which training might be offered.

Another major goal was to produce a set of training materials for use by classroom teachers who work with student teachers or new teachers. The materials included five instructional units: (a) an introductory unit that explores clinical practice as related to the SBTE; (b) a unit on interpersonal communication; (c) a unit on planning that emphasizes joint SBTE-teacher goal setting; (d) a unit on classroom and school data collection procedures; and (e) a followup unit that focuses on presentation and analysis. Each instructional unit is designed for approximately six to eight hours of contact time between participants and facilitator. These units were field-tested in cooperating teacher centers, revised, and then distributed to all teacher centers in the Network. The five instructional units include five filmstrips, seven audiotape programs, participant manuals for each unit, and a facilitator's manual for all units.

In addition to these tangible products, the SBTE program has created a dialogue among teacher educators across the state about the role of SBTEs. This dialogue is enhancing preservice and inservice teacher education within the state.

The SBTE program has received national recognition for its efforts. The Association of Teacher Educators named it one of the three finalists in the Distinguished Program in Teacher Education Award for 1978; and in the same year, it received the Distinguished Achievement Awards Certificate of Recognition from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. These two awards symbolize the importance of this innovative program that focuses on what we believe is a most important role in education, that of the school-based teacher educator.

MASTER OF EDUCATION IN TEACHING DEGREE PROGRAM

The Need

The Master of Education in Teaching Degree Program was created in response to four pressing needs. First, a rather extensive needs assessment of teachers in the Greater Houston area revealed their nearly unanimous need and desire for a graduate level program for the development of their instructional skills. The central concern of those surveyed was improvement of their instructional competence rather than additional study in content specialization areas such as reading and mathematics education. They saw a need for a graduate program for classroom teachers whose primary responsibilities were the day-to-day design, development, implementation, operation, and evaluation of instruction for elementary and secondary students. Many noted that only such a program could "fill in the gaps" their undergraduate teacher education programs had left.

Second, many instructional roles emerging in local school districts seemed to require the skills of instructional specialists. Local districts are employing curriculum coordinators and instructional specialists to work with teachers at the building level to improve the instructional program. These professionals do not serve the traditional function of curriculum consultant or supervisor; their primary role is to give direct assistance to classroom teachers for improvement of instructional practice, especially as it relates to strategies for individualizing instruction, processes for using differentiated staffing patterns, and procedures for implementing new programs. A program was needed to prepare personnel competent to serve in these and other specialized instructional roles.

Third, many local school districts were moving toward differentiating staffing models, to improve delivery of instructional services to students by making better use of professional resources. As roles are differentiated, there is greater need for individuals who can assume leadership roles in team teaching situations. These individuals must be highly skilled in using a variety of instructional strategies if they are to discharge their leadership responsibilities effectively. A program was needed to help teachers develop competencies for such leadership positions.

Finally, it was clear that most local school districts were actively seeking more effective ways to provide continuing education programs for inservice teachers. Graduate teacher education programs, carefully and collaboratively developed by school district and university personnel, were seen as a way to achieve this goal. There appeared to be a need for a program flexible enough to respond to the specific requirements of teachers and local school districts while maintaining a high level of academic respectability. It also appeared that the delivery of coursework at school sites, rather than at the university campus, would enhance the attractiveness of such a program. In addition, a program was needed to train school district personnel for leadership in such inservice/graduate programs at the school district level.

The Program

In Fall 1973, a committee composed of five University of Houston faculty members and the executive director of a local teacher association was formed to explore the need for an additional graduate teacher education program. A series of meetings with a large number of teachers led to the decision that a master's level program was needed for inservice teachers who wished to improve their instructional effectiveness through graduate study but who did not want to pursue study in a specific content field--a Master of Education in Teaching Degree Program.

The committee identified substantive areas which might be included. Fifty teachers reviewed and revised these suggestions, and a questionnaire constructed from the revised list was administered to 200 teachers, who were asked to indicate areas in which courses should be developed. The two areas teachers identified as most critical were "individualizing instruction" and "classroom management." As a result, two of the courses developed for the program were Individualized Instruction and Classroom Management--two courses which remain very popular.

On the basis of the information obtained from the teachers, the committee recommended establishment of a 36 credit-hour program which contained an 18 credit-hour major to be drawn from seven courses and a 3-6 credit-hour internship/practicum experience. The seven courses were: Generic Teaching Strategies, Models of Teaching, Instructional Design, Individualized Instruction, Classroom Management, Institutional Change and Program Management, and Clinical Supervision. (Subsequently, two other courses have been added: Affective Instruction and Instructional Evaluation.) Input from the teachers also caused the committee to recommend that the program be (a) competency based, in that emphasis should be placed on the demonstration of competence to perform professional responsibilities; and (b) field-oriented, in that as many courses as possible should be delivered in the schools.

The program was formally approved in Spring 1974 and the first students were accepted during Summer 1974. Since then nearly 100 students have been admitted; 23 have already graduated. Coursework at present is offered in three field sites. Feedback has been universally favorable, and the program's future looks very bright.

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION DEGREE PROGRAM

The Need

As the College moved to fulfill its commitment to develop a competency-based undergraduate teacher education program, it became increasingly apparent that few teacher educators possess the understandings and skills necessary to design, develop, implement, operate, and evaluate such a program. Feedback from other universities and colleges reinforced this perception. To a large extent, this inadequacy stems from traditional practices that have trained teacher educators within a particular curriculum area. There seemed to be a need to alleviate that problem by adding a program which would train teacher educators as instructional specialists.

B. O. Smith (1968) in Teachers for the Real World, a classic conceptual scheme for the education of teachers, argued that teacher education programs must concern themselves with four major areas: (a) the theoretical knowledge--drawn from psychology, anthropology, sociology, and related disciplines--that the teacher needs to interpret the complex reality of the classroom; (b) the teaching skills required of an effective teacher; (c) the attitudes an effective teacher must possess; and (d) the subject matter knowledge an effective teacher needs. While traditional teacher education programs have focused primarily on the first and last of these areas, skills and attitudes have been largely ignored. The major reason teacher educators have neglected the instructional and attitudinal areas of teaching is that they themselves are largely untrained in those areas; they cannot stress what they do not know. In short, doctoral programs in education have not trained teacher educators to be instructional specialists, the precise role so badly needed by many teacher education programs.

Another argument supporting the need for the doctoral program rested on the growing movement throughout the state and the nation toward competency-based teacher education and certification. Many states--Texas among them--had suggested or required that teacher education programs be designed using a competency-based approach. The move to a competency-based program requires a great deal of effort, and a faculty that both understands competency-based instruction and is able to design instruction that will help prospective teachers acquire teaching competencies which are not appropriately the domain of a specific subject matter field. In addition, the College had received a growing number of inquiries from other institutions about the availability of graduating doctoral students experienced in various phases of our competency-based undergraduate teacher education program development efforts. A doctoral program for teacher educators was seen as a means for the College to begin to meet this need.

The Program

Soon after their arrival at the University of Houston in 1971, the authors recognized the need for a doctoral program which would prepare generic teacher educators. In Spring 1974, we proposed and received approval for the establishment of a Doctor of Education in Teacher Education Degree Program.

The program proposed to prepare graduates for any of a number of teacher educator roles, including director of teacher education programs; director of field and laboratory experiences; faculty member in inservice teacher education programs in school districts; teacher education program developer; designer of instructional systems for research and development laboratories; and evaluator of teacher education programs for state education agencies. Graduates would be competent to: (a) function effectively as highly skilled teacher educators; (b) design, organize, implement, operate, and evaluate various types of instructional systems; (c) design conceptual models of teacher education programs using systems approaches; (d) design, develop, and operate teacher training procedures such as microteaching, simulation techniques, and field experiences; (e) train teachers in the full range of generic instructional and managerial techniques; (f) function as clinical supervisors of teachers; (g) evaluate the effectiveness of teacher education programs and instructional systems; and (h) conduct research in teacher education and teacher effectiveness.

Normally, at least 66 credit hours of coursework and dissertation are required for the degree. A minimum of 27 credit hours must be in the major area--Teacher Education Program Area courses. These courses include those previously listed for the Master of Education in Teaching, plus Research in Teacher Effectiveness, Conceptual Models of Teacher Education, Competency Based Teacher Education, and Research Seminar in Teacher Education. All students also complete 3-6 credit hours in a supervised internship/practicum.

For most doctoral students, the undergraduate teacher education program serves as a setting in which the student gains practical experience while demonstrating certain required competencies. While the doctoral program places great emphasis on the competencies the doctoral student is expected to demonstrate, the conceptual understandings that undergird these competencies also are emphasized. Instruction stressing concepts and theories from educational psychology, education sociology, systems theory, and other related fields provides students with the cognitive understandings prerequisite to their demonstration of the competencies required. In addition, students are expected to acquire and demonstrate the research and statistical competence of a beginning scholar.

57

Since it first began to recruit students in Summer 1974, the program has accepted 22 students, including four Australians, two Canadians, and a Nigerian. To date, six have graduated. The program continues to grow in both size and stature as it attracts able students and faculty members.

CONCLUSION

We believe that graduate teacher education is alive and well. There are certain unique needs of teachers that can best be met through organized, planned graduate programs. If they are responsive to those needs and readily accessible to teachers and those who work with teachers, these programs will continue to thrive.

REFERENCES

Cogan, Morris. "Current Issues in the Education of Teachers." In: Kevin Ryan, ed. Teacher Education: Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1975.

Corrigan, Dean C. "The Future Implications for the Preparation of Educational Personnel." Journal of Teacher Education 25: 100-107; 1974.

Dunkin, Michael J., and Bruce J. Biddle. The Study of Teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

Fuller, Frances F., and Oliver H. Bown. "Becoming a Teacher." In: Kevin Ryan, ed. Teacher Education: Seventy-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1975.

Howsam, Robert B. Now You Shall Be Real to Everyone. The 17th Annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Smith, B. Othanel. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

Tittle, Carol K. Student Teaching: Attitude and Research Bases for Change in School and University. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1974.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

Robert L. Erdman

Programs for the preparation of teachers have been a significant and integral part of the culture of Utah since settlement of the territory in 1847. Many of Utah's early pioneers were educated in New England and brought with them a strong and idealistic commitment to the need for education. Historical annals record the early establishment of parent schools to educate the children and to prepare future teachers. Although these schools found a minimum of success, the need for programs of teacher education had been well implanted. Therefore, when the University of Deseret (now the University of Utah) was founded in 1850, a "normal department" was established, offering a two-year program for teacher preparation (Willey, 1952).

The early commitment to teacher education was reaffirmed in 1896 when Utah gained statehood. The first Utah legislature mandated:

> The Normal School shall be continued as a Department of the University for students of both sexes, and its courses of instruction may extend to a period of four years, or until graduation, and its courses shall include practice teaching and instruction in pedagogy (Laws of Utah, 1896, p. 275).

The Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees in Education were authorized in 1909, and seven years later the first Master of Arts degree in Education was granted. It was to take more than 40 more years before programs leading to the Master of Science, Doctor of Philosophy, and Doctor of Education degrees were to be offered, and not until the latter half of the 1960s were programs culminating in the Master of Education and Education Specialist degrees authorized.

The historical emergence and development of graduate degree programs in the School of Education clearly reflected the simultaneously increasing specialization and diversification in education and society. As new personnel roles emerged, the School responded with appropriate preparation programs, frequently incorporated into the rubric of various degree models. Insidiously, the mission of graduate study became over-identified with role preparation.

In historical retrospect, the School probably made an understandable strategical error by not assuming closer identification with the emerging mission of the University; for as the University broadened its purposes, the major segments of the School tended to continue emphasizing communication of knowledge through role preparation programs. However, a few programs did attempt to mesh with the multiple purposes ". . . of discovery, organization, dissemination, and communication of knowledge." The two orientations led to qualitative and quantitative differences among graduate programs. Over time, the collegial community perceived the disparity of mission, and the chords of dissonance were struck and have echoed over the past three decades.

The uneven response to shifting University demands may be explained partially by the mixed rationale for department or division creation. Some, such as Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Special Education, and Educational Administration, were established as role-oriented entities; their historical roots emanated from the purposes of the "normal department." Others--Educational Psychology, Cultural Foundations--were from their inception more discipline- or content-centered, paralleling other academic units on campus. Thus the organizational development within the School appears to have evolved more by historical accident than by design, and the organizational structure continues to influence the purposes, structure, and content of graduate study.

Today the Graduate School of Education is an organization in transition--its faculty, programs, and students. Its purposes and functions are increasingly experiencing internal and external influences for change. While the resulting disequilibrium may be disconcerting and overwhelming, it does provide the potential for proactive leadership behaviors: the faculty and administration have the opportunity to become the architects of their future by design rather than by historical happenstance.

With this brief historical purview of our graduate programs as prologue, the following sections will describe their current status, influencing forces, some substantive issues, and futuristic considerations. The scenario is purposely condensed and illustrative, but it may provide the reader with some understanding of how one School strives to learn from the past, cope with the present, and build for the future in graduate study.

CURRENT STATUS

The University of Utah, located in Salt Lake City, has a full-time enrollment of approximately 22,000 students. The Graduate School of Education is one of 14 Schools and Colleges within the University authorized to grant undergraduate and graduate degrees. Although its name was officially changed in 1964 from the State College of Education to the Graduate School of Education, the School has retained several undergraduate programs and degrees. Efforts to move these to the graduate level have been discouraged for political and economic reasons.

The Graduate School of Education is divided into five academic departments, with a variety of degree programs encompassed in each unit. In addition, a number of programs are offered leading to various state certificates granted by the Utah State Board of Education. In many instances, components of a certification program may be incorporated into the undergraduate or graduate degree program.

As of 1977 the School had 76 full-time faculty positions budgeted from state-appropriated funds. Approximately 15 additional full-time faculty are supported by extramural funding. The faculty is further augmented by 20-30 part-time persons from other academic units of the University or from agencies in the metropolitan community.

Faculty members are expected to fulfill obligations in teaching, scholarship, and service. Evidence from all three domains is utilized as a basis for promotion and salary determination.

Degree Programs

Only two departments--Educational Administration and Educational Psychology--offer degree programs at the doctoral and master's levels. Educational Systems and Learning Resources offers a degree program exclusively at the master's level. Both baccalaureate and master's degree programs are offered in Education and Special Education.

Twenty-one different programs of study lead to some type of graduate degree. Of this number, eleven are exclusively limited to the M.S., M.A., or M.Ed. degree (programs in Elementary and Secondary Education, Special Education, Educational Systems and Learning Resources). Four programs are offered at both the master's and the Ph.D. levels (cultural foundations, counseling and instructional psychology, school psychology). The program in educational administration is at the post-master's level and culminates in the Education Specialist degree (state certification) and/or the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree.

Current degree program emphasis resulted from a degree and role policy adopted by the Utah State Board of Regents in 1972 (Utah State System of Higher Education, 1972). This policy emanated from a perceived need to minimize duplication of degree programs in education at all state colleges and universities. Consequently the Department of Education was ordered to terminate its Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs. A master's degree ceiling placed on programs in Special Education and Media (Educational Systems and Learning Resources) curtailed any aspirations for their expansion into doctoral level programs.

Awarded Graduate Degrees

Over the past five years (1972-77) the School has produced 344 doctoral degrees, 1102 master's degrees, and 105 Education Specialist degrees. Data for the five-year period show a 26 percent decrease in the number of doctoral degrees awarded, and a 35 percent decrease in the number of master's degrees awarded. These decreases may reflect the Regents' degree/program restriction, increasing quality standards for admission, and a dwindling gap between supply and demand.

Even with this substantial reduction, the School of Education ranked third in the number (N=45) of doctorates (Ed.D. and Ph.D.) awarded within the University for 1977; only the Colleges of Law and Medicine produced more professional degrees. In the same year the School produced 160 master's degrees. Again Education ranked third; the Colleges of Business and Social-Behavioral Science awarded 395 and 227 master's degrees respectively.

Analysis of conferred graduate degrees by sex indicates that at the doctoral level 76 percent were awarded to men and 24 percent to women. At the master's level, however, 57 percent of the degrees were awarded to women and 43 percent to men (University of Utah, 1977).

Graduate Placement

Recent placement data for doctoral graduates (Educational Psychology and Cultural Foundations/Educational Administration) yield two major observations. First, graduates are securing initial job placement in a broad array of organizational settings. Over a three-year period (1975-76 to 1977-78) 79 percent of all Educational Psychology graduates were placed in higher education or public service settings; the remainder were placed in public school settings or private enterprise. Over an eight-year period 80 percent of all doctoral graduates in Educational Administration/Cultural Foundations secured positions in the public schools or higher education, the others in public service or private enterprise.

The second observation focuses on shifting placement opportunities for these graduates, particularly in the Educational Administration/Cultural

Foundations programs. Comparative data from the decades of the sixties and seventies indicated a 21 percent decrease in the number of graduates placed in public schools. Higher education, private enterprise, and public service have shown rather substantial increases in placement. While the proportional placement in public schools has decreased, there also appear to be some changes in level of position secured: during the sixties most graduates entered at relatively top-level administrative positions such as superintendencies or the principalship, whereas many graduates today are entering positions at lower administrative levels--as assistant superintendent or assistant principal. This may suggest an adequate supply of high-level administrative public school personnel with doctoral degrees. Consequently, persons with such career goals are finding that the only way to advance in the administrative hierarchy is through extensive periods of preparation, including advanced study and experience.

Placement in higher education positions increased 21 percent over the same two periods. A relatively small percentage entered professorships in educational administration; the largest group consisted of individuals who had been previously employed in higher education and who returned to their positions after completing a degree. Usually they were middle management administrators or master's level faculty from small colleges; and most often they were from fields without well-established doctoral programs in the region--nursing, media, laboratory science, or medical education. Apparently the content of educational administration complemented career goals for these individuals.

Graduates of master's programs continue to find public education the primary arena for employment. This is not surprising, since the preponderance of all applicants are already employed in the schools and are using the advanced degree route for role improvement or as a means of shifting roles within their setting.

Admission

In an effort to exercise greater quality control, all graduate degree programs have some form of admission quota. Eligibility for consideration is determined by various cutoff levels in the several degree programs; programs and degrees differ in how they combine the admission variables in decision making.

The quota system has proved relatively effective, but not problem-free. Highly qualified students may be denied admission when need for personnel is great. Finding valid strategies for admission of minority students has been a continual problem; to date, no really satisfactory solution has been found.

INFLUENCING FORCES

Each year an increasing number of forces impinge on the School's programs of graduate study. Many of these are manifested in mandates with no options. Some take the form of overt or covert political/economic pressure. Still others convey options allowing for degrees of rational/critical thinking in decision making.

These forces are accompanied by new and often competing values. The School then, of necessity, must engage in value clarification and planning if its mission and programs are to have validity and credibility. However, demands on time and effort for this process are becoming so great that faculty resistance to participation is increasing--understandably so, since it is often minimized as valid faculty endeavor in the institutional reward system.

Short- and long-term planning is vital for systematizing and forecasting change. It is increasingly apparent to me that the preservation of traditional faculty participation in planning will be dependent on the future design and development of appropriate support systems.

Several of the generating environments for influencing forces on the Graduate School of Education are described here.

Approval/Accrediting Agencies

Maintenance and regulation of high-quality program standards must be assumed as part of basic professional responsibility. Accrediting or approval agencies have been developed to ensure that these standards are maintained. The problems for the School of Education derive from the number of and articulation among the involved agencies.

Three major organizations are involved in review and approval of our graduate programs: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the Utah State Board of Education, and the University Graduate Council. Two of these groups require a program review every five years and one, every seven years; therefore, graduate (and undergraduate) programs are reviewed five times in a ten-year span. All the reviews require varying degrees of self-study or reporting, and onsite visits by individuals or teams. Although each review has a slightly different focus and format, there is much similarity between the standards employed. Inordinate amounts of faculty time and financial resources are consumed in the process.

In addition, specialized professional organizations such as the American Psychological Association maintain an accreditation program. The federal government also has entered the scene indirectly as in the case of special education, where extensive program information must be provided and approved before federal monies are granted for personnel training.

When is enough enough? This School has reached a saturation point, and the potential benefits and opportunities for self-direction and improvement are becoming increasingly more diffuse and complex.

One solution to the problem might be a coordinated review by all groups, and some discussions have already occurred to this effect. While this may be a strong conservation measure, it also presents major risks, not the least of which may be the loss of independent evaluation and judgment.

State and Federal Legislation

Much legislation continues to have significant impact on quantitative and qualitative dimensions of graduate program activity. The availability of federal funds has enabled the School to develop and strengthen selected programs of teaching, research, and service, as has been most dramatically illustrated in special education. An array of federal grants has enabled rapid expansion of a diversified mission within the School, the state, and the region. Two projects in particular--a Dean's grant and a regional resource center--have had a broad and major influence. The Dean's project, funded through the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH), serves as a major catalytic change agent within the entire School. Selected faculty members from all departments are actively participating in curriculum development projects designed to interrelate special education content with their own content areas. In addition, the project serves as a forum for strengthening interdepartmental cooperation and communication within the School.

The Southwest Regional Resource Center, also funded through BEH, provides leadership service to programs of special education in five Rocky Mountain states, departments of education, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The center has proved to be a viable model for facilitating inter- and intrastate cooperation and interfacing University programs with the field.

Unfortunately, other graduate programs are experiencing the demise of federal funding. In some cases this has caused shifts in faculty interests and has weakened the research base for selected programs of graduate study. Similarly, some faculty members have become discouraged in submitting proposals because the chance for successful funding is so minimal they question time and effort expended. Increasingly, they are looking to state and local education agencies for research funding. In some instances, the research personnel and resources of those agencies overshadow the resources of some units in the School of Education. The current constellation of funding patterns, if continued, will further erode faculty research productivity and de-escalate theoretical projects.

At the state level there is an increasing tendency to use mandatory legislation as a means of prescribing curriculum. While this trend has been most noticeable in programs of initial teacher certification, its impact is felt at the graduate level. Because of inadequate funds, programs have had to deploy faculty members teaching graduate level courses to cover the increasing number of mandated courses.

On the horizon is also the possibility that state legislation may be mandated to require all School of Education faculty members to return as an elementary or secondary classroom teacher every five years. While the idea may have some virtue, it fails to consider the extensive and varied interactions already existing; nor does it consider the fact that the requirement may not be valid for all graduate faculty members, because of their specific role functions.

Utah State Board of Regents

The Utah State Board of Regents was created in 1969 as a board with control over all state universities and colleges. Its major functions included eliminating unnecessary duplication of programs and, to some extent, minimizing the competition for state funds among institutions for higher learning. One of its first major thrusts, a study of degrees and programs in schools of education, resulted in degree and program assignments for all the institutions. As previously indicated, the University was restricted to offering doctoral degrees in three fields--educational administration, cultural foundations, and educational psychology. Graduate work in education was assigned to the two state universities. Recently the board deviated from this policy when they authorized an M.Ed. degree at one of the state colleges in close proximity to the two state universities.

The degree and role assignment did have an immediate and direct negative impact on faculty, students, programs, and resources--particularly in departments that lost degrees or were restricted in their degree offerings.

In the role assignment language, these departments were oriented toward programs of personnel preparation; the designations conveyed a primary mission that did not reflect the more comprehensive mission of the University. Departments that could not offer a doctoral degree were seriously jeopardized in their capacity for theoretical scholarship productivity and the recruitment and retention of distinguished scholars--both perceived by the University as prime prerequisites for high-quality programs of graduate study.

Currently one master's degree level department is in the process of restructuring its organizational pattern in an attempt to respond more thoroughly and systematically to the multiple-mission demand. The plan calls for reconceptualizing faculty role through a system of differential staffing: one faculty cluster will focus primarily on personnel preparation, and another group on the theoretical content areas related to the field. Both groups will be expected to strive toward a high quality of teaching, scholarship, and service. The expectation is that the nature of course content and scholarship produced will reflect these different orientations, thus enabling the total department to respond more parsimoniously to various constituency expectations with a greater degree of credibility.

On the surface, such a division of labor as portrayed by the Regents might have been efficacious. A more basic concern is the nature of graduate study in education: Is it perceived as only role preparation, so that it is immaterial how the spoils are divided? Are the parameters of content so poorly defined that all knowledge becomes inclusive? Have we become so specialized that the concepts of generality and totality among educational areas are no longer applicable? Rationality and logic dictate negative responses, and still so many policies and practices contraindicate implied professional values. As an education profession, can we agree? Where was the profession when such policies were formulated?

University Academic and Financial Planning

Budget constraints and exigencies are a reality within academia. No unit can escape the demands such forces impose. Clearly, the situation calls for retrenchment, redefinition, and redistribution of resources. What remains unclear are the criteria to be employed for such determination within the School and the University.

The School of Education is one of 14 units competing for limited resources. All of the academic units contain programs emphasizing the generation and dissemination of knowledge. All are concerned with the values and traditions of past, present, and future histories. All claim a right for existence because of varying degrees of societal need or enrichment. All are worthy, but which shall receive priority? The question, and the potential answers, are value-laden. Our worth is compared with the societally prestigious professions of law and medicine, with the basic sciences and their rapid advancement of knowledge, or with business and its expanding influence on the economy. It is within this highly competitive context that the School of Education must operate, and the achievement of parity for limited resources becomes increasingly more difficult.

Programs of graduate study appear vulnerable within this competitive academic marketplace. Their justification for existence is frequently perceived by critics as a means for mobility and/or monetary reward within the profession; and the use of graduate degrees as a vehicle for professional improvement is an anathema. There is increasing conceptual confusion between the purposes and structures of professional and academic degrees. Research paradigms and products are frequently characterized as failing to meet high quality standards of scholarship. Some critics describe programs as professionally self-serving and not in harmony with other models of graduate study in the University. Occasionally the School is perceived as lacking viable major commodities that can be used by the University to enhance its negotiating power within the societal structure. While such criticisms may reflect prejudice and bias about the School and Education in general, they just may be sufficiently symptomatic to warrant very rigorous internal evaluation and study as a prelude to redirection of our course. Motivation for change must not just stem from survival strategies but must be energized by responsible professional stewardship.

While priorities are being established within the University, the School also is being asked to do the same. Which programs of graduate study shall be nourished, sustained, eliminated, or added? Choices must be made; on what bases shall such decisions rest? The task has been partially completed through the Regents' role and degree policy; but more remains to be done, and unless the School assumes responsible leadership, external forces will further restrict opportunities for self-direction and control.

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

Graduate study in the School of Education can be characterized by its multiplicity of purpose, structure, and curricula, as clearly manifested in the diversity and specialization of program and degree patterns. Many of these programs were initiated with varying degrees of conceptual clarity and have been maintained because of need and tradition. Shifting forces for change that are now challenging these conceptual models are resulting in substantive issues of concern. Traditional perceptions of purpose, structure, and curricula are becoming increasingly more diffuse and ambiguous. The School is now attempting to intervene through planning and evaluation.

Issues of Purpose

The concept of graduate study has evolved into one of mixed purposes, compounded by programs for state certification intertwined with those for degrees. Consequently some graduate programs were designed for specialized entry into the profession; a few for improvement of role competence; some for changing roles within the profession; and still others for systematic study about education. Explanation of this matrix became a herculean task.

The manifestations of this conceptual mixture were professionally painful, demoralizing, and unfulfilling. Confusion and diffusion characterized perception of purpose by many constituencies, and schizophrenic behavior permeated faculty teaching, research, and service. the total organization felt called for, but wasn't sure how to get there.

Innumerable hypotheses about causes of the malady could be offered. Some arise from historical tradition and mandated policies, others from a failure of the organization to plan for and be responsive to the clarion calls for change. A simplistic explanation is not possible.

Recovery was and still is essential for organizational survival. Two tentative models have been postulated for unraveling the twisted strands of purpose. Although not fully conceptualized or developed, they serve as points of departure. One focuses on role, the other on academic content. Both have been described extensively in professional literature. Both, if carried to fruition, have logical extensions requiring diversity and differentiation. Paradoxically, both have been present, but have lost much of their conceptual integrity over time.

The role model assumes that purpose is associated with development and improvement of competence in professional practice. Value is measured by its direct applicability to practical utility; a minimal or increased level of competence in professional practice is the major criterion. Successful accomplishment increases the rewards and status of the candidate in the broad professional education community.

By contrast, in the academic content model the purpose of graduate study is directed toward advancing knowledge in the content and processes of education through systematic scholarship. Such advancement takes the form of academic pursuit and is not constrained by demands for direct application in professional practice. The academic community serves as the primary public for this orientation. Quality of scholastic behavior is the major criterion for evaluation. An advanced degree advances the candidate's rewards and status in the academic community and establishes the individual as a peer colleague with other academics.

The very nature of the profession itself dictates the need for both orientations. Relationships do need to be preserved because of the interdependence between theory and practice. Some Schools have had the freedom to opt for one approach or another. This School does not, and therefore clear articulation of the nature of this interdependence must occur within and between programs.

These models can lead to strong conflicting forces within an organization, but that need not be the case if teaching, research, and service patterns are permitted diversity and differentiation reflecting stated purpose. Scholarly attributes must be maintained in both models, but the manifestations may differ. Perhaps every program can then more appropriately reflect the University mission for ". . . discovery, organization, dissemination, and communication of knowledge."

Continued conceptual delineation will have to be associated with the establishment of priorities; limited human and material resources preclude attainment of excellence in all phases of endeavor. The tasks have been defined and planning is underway, but it will be an exercise in futility unless various external educational policy and planning bodies are also included; for it has been their mandates and controls that have helped contribute to the current state of affairs.

Issues of Degree Structure

Logically, a high degree of congruence should exist between purposes and degree structures. However, as purposes have become diffused and ambiguous, so have the structures. Original distinguishing characteristics between degrees have been diminished. Paper distinctions still appear, but there is an emerging gap of conceptual credibility.

The structure and content of professional degrees (M.Ed. and Ed.D.) and academic degrees (M.S. and Ph.D.) appear similar, although remnants of conceptual delineations still exist whereby the former reflect the "role model" and the latter the "academic content model." Professional degrees may still contain a professional field experience component, a greater number of credit hours, more courses oriented toward practice, and an applied type of research project for the dissertation. In actuality, these same components can be found in some academic degrees. Such a situation may suggest a weakening of conceptual differences, poor degree control, or confusion over professional role requirements.

Similarly, patterns of employment for doctoral graduates provide minimal evidence for unique degree distinctions. A few organizations may still require a Ph.D. graduate because of the implied academic research orientation, but it is increasingly more common to observe that either a Ph.D. or an Ed.D. is required for entry into a particular position.

In differentiating between degrees at the master's program level, the same observations can be made. The specific degree appears to have little relationship to the particular educational role. In any group of classroom teachers performing comparable roles, one may well expect to find persons with the M.A., M.S., or M.Ed. degree; the degree pattern usually relates to matters of personal preference and interest, difficulty of degree requirements, or availability.

Professional and academic degrees have become an enigma for the Graduate School of Education. Although conceptual clarification will aid in clearer delineation, there remains the agonizing question of whether two different degree routes are needed. If the variety of graduate degrees does not relate to identifiable role or content competence, are they nothing more than artifacts? Certainly the School must assume partial responsibility for this situation, but so must the field. Delineation of purpose and structure will be to no avail unless there is some consensual agreement within the profession as to the purpose and meaning of the various degrees, and unless employment practices then more closely adhere to these agreed-upon definitions.

Another dimension of the issue relates to state certification requirements controlled by the State Board of Education. In essence, the multiple purposes for certification parallel those of the "role model" at the baccalaureate and master's degree levels. It is not uncommon to find large segments of a certification program incorporated into various degree programs. Over time, some of these certification programs have become almost synonymous with graduate programs, except that the University does require some additional work. Thus clarification between and within degree programs must be extended to include certification. Perhaps it is understandable why many field practitioners are angry, confused, and disappointed as they try to navigate their way through this labyrinth for career development.

Issues of Curricula

Of all programs within the School, those offering the Ph.D. degree have come closest to defining the parameters of curriculum and instruction with clarity and precision. Total curricular design is geared toward the systematic study of theoretical bodies of knowledge. Experimental and scholarly research is an integral part of the program. Direct application to practice may come incidentally or after study in a given course sequence. Integration and unification of content occur over time. The University is perceived as the focus for the instructional setting, and a variety of societal agencies are viewed as potential laboratories. Revision of program content for the M.S. degree is following a similar thrust. Academic tradition has served as a valuable resource.

Programs offering professional degrees have not achieved this clarity and precision in curriculum and instruction. Academic structure and tradition have not been particularly helpful. A role model orientation by definition focuses on the competencies, problems, and issues associated with or specifically required for professional practice. Content from an array of curricular areas may be required for successful resolution or performance. Portions of content must be integrated and utilized immediately for direct response. Relevance of content is determined by its direct applicability to behavioral performance. The nature of the role influences the instructional field setting. These philosophical guidelines are being used in M.Ed. programs as they become more field-centered and competency-based; the design and organization of content for the Ed.D. remain more enigmatic because a clear conceptualization of need has not been resolved.

Concerns also arise when degree and program designs require students to mix courses from the two approaches. Theoretically, mixed orientations may be worthy and defensible from a teacher-scholar frame of reference, but in practice they tend to result in isolated and fragmented episodes in a graduate school career, and the relationship to purpose is obscured. Curricular relevancy soon comes into question.

Another major concern is that the increasing number and diversity of role specialties have had profound impact on proliferation of curricular content. Role specialists specify content that will help develop competencies for a given assignment. Such an approach has validity, but it does present problems of articulation between programs. How necessary is it for each program to have its own courses in areas such as cultural foundations, curriculum, pedagogical principles of teaching? Are there not general principles governing bodies of knowledge that transcend role specialties? Most faculty members would agree that there are commonalities with some differentiating factors. Operationally, however, they encounter such problems as competition for student credit hours; lack of interest from fellow academics; some loss of control over a program; or variances in validity and reliability of content, as different faculty members teach courses or modules.

There is also the need for evaluation of curricular relationships with other academic units of the University. Duplication of courses is apparent, and the question to be addressed is what are the parameters governing the content in the Graduate School of Education, and what might be more appropriately and economically utilized from other Colleges?

FUTURISTIC CONSIDERATIONS

The future of graduate study must be predicated on adherence to the highest standards of quality control. Pragmatically, such criteria need to reflect the varying models of purpose, and by definition must allow for differentiation and variation. Such standards of excellence may be achieved in different modes as the comprehensive University mission is fulfilled.

Qualitative contributions to the profession and society will be determined by continued recruitment and retention of scholars of distinction and graduate students of the highest caliber. Sustained effort must be made to improve the resources and mechanisms for production of theoretical and applied scholarship.

Underlying this general constellation of graduate study is the imperative need for cyclical planning within varying time periods. Priorities will have to be established in the already designated degree/certification programs. Limited resources dictate that responsiveness to new needs must be based on the elimination or delimitation of some existing programs. In the process, strategies must be developed to ensure that academic and professional practice orientations are preserved with some degree of balance. Although this may be contrary to the perceptions of some groups, the very future of the profession demands no less.

The impact of change will also affect faculty role and organizational structure. Traditional concepts of specialization and permanence will have to be tempered with the increasing awareness of the need for fluidity and flexibility. Planning must anticipate all these contingencies.

Corporately, the School does have options in determining the future course of graduate study. The quality of choice will be determined by our ability to use rational, intellectual behavior when the cumulative knowledge of today is employed as a means in forecasting the eventual tomorrows. Future history will judge the wisdom of our actions.

REFERENCES

Laws of Utah, 1896, Chapter 83, February 11, 1896.

University of Utah. Statistical Report, 1976-77. Salt Lake City, Utah: Academic and Financial Planning Office, 1977.

Utah State System of Higher Education. Teacher Education Programs in the Utah System of Higher Education. Salt Lake City, Utah: Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, 1972.

Willey, Darrell S. A History of Teacher Training at the University, 1850-1950. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1952.

GRADUATE TEACHER EDUCATION: IN CRISIS OR TRANSITION?

John D. Mulhern

Graduate teacher education, no less than all other phases of education, is faced with the problems of declining enrollment, a lack of confidence in the profession's ability to right itself, and an identity crisis that strikes at the heart of graduate education. Little or no attention has been focused on graduate teacher education programs because, until the mid-1970s, enrollments generally held steady. Now, however, the enrollment decline has caught up to the graduate programs, and they are coming under long-overdue scrutiny.

THE CURRENT CRISIS

A crisis does exist, and is well documented in recent issues of practically all the professional journals. The major danger in the current crisis is that, after a cursory examination, the programs will be proclaimed appropriate for the coming decade, and the opportunity for substantive change in programs that are in need of revitalization will be lost.

The Crisis of Enrollments. Graduate teacher education programs enroll both preservice and inservice teachers in a wide variety of programs. The major focus of most of the programs is the training or retraining of personnel for new positions within the education sector. Teachers who are interested in becoming administrators, curriculum specialists, or guidance counselors enroll in preparation programs leading to certification in those areas. Similarly, teachers seeking supplemental endorsements as reading teachers or special education teachers enroll in programs where the emphasis is on new teaching skills for classroom teachers.

The graduate entry-level programs have experienced sharp curtailment as interest in teaching declined during the early 1970s; many of these programs are now little more than the undergraduate course offerings supplemented with some graduate course substitutions. The bulk of the enrollment at the graduate level consists of inservice teachers; and as fewer new teachers, counselors, and administrators are hired, the pool of potential graduate students is diminished and graduate enrollments decline correspondingly.

Statewide figures for Michigan serve to highlight the extent of the decline. In 1970-71, Michigan institutions prepared 16,798 teacher education graduates. That number decreased to 13,417 in 1973-74 and to 9,782 in 1976-77. (The decline has continued, but an accurate count is not yet available for 1977-78.) The 1976-77 figure of 9,782 must be considered in light of the fact that fewer than 4,500 new teachers were hired in Michigan during 1977-78, and that traditionally about 30 percent of the teacher education graduates take positions outside of teaching. Consequently the total statewide pool of new potential graduate students for 1977-78 enrollments was somewhere between the number of newly hired teachers (approximately 4,000) and the potential pool of new teachers (approximately 7,000). In further illustration: one Michigan teacher preparation institution reported the issuance of 1,953 teaching credentials in 1970-71, 1,542 in 1973-74, and 824 in 1977-78.

These figures can be duplicated throughout the country, and enrollments in graduate teacher education will continue to decline as the pool of new teacher education graduates and new teacher hires continues to shrink.

The Crisis of Confidence. Public confidence in society's institutions has eroded greatly over the past ten years. This is particularly true with respect to public education, and is evident in higher education as well as in elementary and secondary education. The public's attitude is manifested by rejected bond issues, millage defeats, tax limitation plans, literacy tests for high school graduates, and competency tests for teacher education graduates. The public believes the explanation for why Johnny can't read is due in part to the failure of colleges of education to prepare teachers to teach, and the message is loud and clear that the public is no longer willing to support programs and institutions without question.

In much the same way that authors and publishers have pointed out the failure of the elementary and secondary schools to educate their students, teachers are pointing out the failure of the colleges of education to prepare them adequately to become teachers. This phenomenon has reached near epidemic proportions with the formation of teacher-controlled teacher centers, quotas on the numbers of student teachers, and the disinterest teachers show in graduate programs by refusing to enroll in them. One gleans the impression that professors of education similarly lack confidence in the ability of their colleagues to respond to the crisis. Simplified solutions are often proposed for the complex issues or the crisis is simply ignored. Finally, potential teachers themselves express their lack of confidence in the preparation programs and in the education profession by electing alternative career choices. Seldom, if ever, does anyone now counsel a mature adult on a career change to teaching.

Just as concomitant rewards follow success and enhance that success, concomitant liabilities accompany reversals. Teacher education in general, but graduate teacher education in particular, suffers from a string of reversals and the concomitant liabilities associated with them.

The Crisis of Identity. At the very time it can least afford such liabilities, graduate teacher education also is suffering from an identity crisis, from a lack of commitment on the part of colleges and universities to the solution of classroom instructional problems. As drops in enrollment at the local level cause the need for new teachers to decline, the local schools are faced with using internal resources to fill positions created by new programmatic needs; thus schools must ask their teaching and administrative staffs to become skilled in the new pedagogical tasks. With no new funds to hire expert personnel, the only alternative is continued professional development; and the viability of this alternative may ultimately depend upon whether or not the necessary training resources are available to the teachers.

An elementary school that has never had to accommodate physically impaired youngsters, for example, under Public Law 94-142 must now provide a complete program of physical and academic development for them. As far as professional training is concerned, the services of several specialists in the college of education--in physical therapy, school environments, administrative legal compliance, and other areas--may be called on for assistance. These specialists must function as teachers/consultants; a role not dissimilar to the current faculty role, but one that requires a different operating style for the individuals and a different pattern of funding for the college. The "mainstreamed" handicapped student has a right to receive adequate and competent treatment; schools have a need to develop new skills in presently employed personnel; the state has an obligation to its citizens to see that the personnel are adequately prepared; and graduate teacher education must have the resources to fulfill this obligation, this need, and this right.

This tripartite crisis permeates the fabric of graduate education and conditions much of the current upheaval in program renewal. The remainder of this chapter examines the two major thrusts of colleges of education--preservice or entry-level programs, and inservice or continuing professional development programs--in light of the crisis. In addition, a plan of action is proposed to meet the challenge presented and to redirect resources.

PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

The executive director of the National Education Association, Terry Herndon, recently recommended that "colleges of education, in collaboration with the National Education Association and its affiliates, should plan and pursue their further evolution into graduate level professional schools" (Herndon, 1976, p. 29). Although graduate entry-level programs do exist at public institutions where the vast majority of teachers are prepared, the admitted emphasis is on the undergraduate programs. More often, one is apt to find the graduate level professional school at a private institution with smaller, more selective programs. Herndon's concept is not new; it does merit examination and discussion at this point in the evolution of teacher education.

A graduate professional school, like all other graduate level programs, would require completion of a baccalaureate degree for admission to the program. Although a graduate level professional school would offer some organizational advantages, it is not a necessary condition in order to offer a graduate entry-level program. Several advantages inherent in graduate level teacher education programs need to be examined in light of the disadvantages. Four frequently cited advantages of a graduate level program include a greater opportunity for quality selection of candidates, the matching of entrants to the areas of demand for teachers, an improved climate for field practice, and an improved practicum through an internship.

Quality Selection of Candidates. In large comprehensive programs on the undergraduate level, a philosophy of self-selection and retention persists even though it is not documented. It has been assumed that, over a time span of 3-4 years, students will drop out of the program because they fail to gain satisfaction in working with elementary or secondary school age youths. This assumption was probably accurate when teacher education was in fact a four-year program and included significant practicum time under the supervision of an affiliated laboratory school teacher. However, the situation today is radically different; large percentages of teacher education students enter programs at the beginning of the junior year and many others after graduation from a four-year college. The program is already compressed and students are less likely to deselect themselves as juniors or seniors than they are as freshmen and sophomores. Furthermore, few students are dropped from the program on an involuntary basis. Consequently, virtually all students who want to complete the teacher education program do so with few effective barriers established to screen out teacher candidates of limited potential.

A graduate entry-level program would contribute to the selection process. Students failing to meet minimum admission standards and marginal students would be denied admission to the program.

Matching of Entrants to Areas of Demand. Present practice at the undergraduate level is to offer classes when enrollments or projected enrollments warrant them. Seldom if ever is a program offering limited because of a surplus in that particular field. This phenomenon is not limited to colleges of education; it is prevalent throughout higher education and is founded on the "right of students to elect." Although professional schools traditionally set selective standards and enrollment quotas that are compatible with a realistic job market potential, this approach is denied as a legitimate planning tool in teacher education. Consequently students are permitted to oversubscribe in areas of extreme teacher surplus while nothing is done to recruit for areas of teacher shortage.

Student course election, the only planning tool now utilized by the colleges, can be defended no longer. Maximum student admissions could easily be established for specific teaching fields in the graduate program. In this way, the admissions program could control not only quality but also the potential number of teachers for a given subject area or level. Unlike the undergraduate level, where such a program would deny currently enrolled students access to programs of their choice, the graduate program admissions deal with only prospective students.

Improved Climate for Field Practice. Currently the relationship between the teaching profession and the teacher education profession is charged with accusations of noncooperation. Although each side feels its position on the issue of teacher production is misrepresented and distorted by the other side, some examples of statewide cooperation exist. On the local district level, relationships generally are much more positive because of a variety of bonds that have been cultivated over a period of years. There is no question about the need for greater cooperation between the leadership of the teaching profession and the colleges of education in order to de-escalate the feelings of mistrust. A graduate program with selective admissions, related to realistic job market opportunities, would greatly enhance the establishment of improved relationships.

Improved Practicum Through Internship. Underlying the entire concept of a graduate entry-level program is the development of a paid internship. An internship whereby a person not yet fully certificated is assigned as a beginning teacher under close supervision by the district and the college of education is more attractive during periods of teacher shortage than it is during times of teacher surplus. However, a graduate internship where each first-year teacher continues professional development under the auspices of the college of education and at the same time assumes responsibility for a classroom would constitute a breakthrough in college/public school relationships. In such a plan, the number of internships would be limited to the number of vacant teaching positions, and the teachers-in-training would have to compete with each other in order to complete their teaching credential. Consequently, not all persons admitted to a teacher preparation program would be able to complete it--only those who were successful in securing one of the public school internships. In such an arrangement, the public schools would select the interns, thus retaining normal control over personnel selection.

Obviously, there are disadvantages associated with a selective admission, graduate level program that would encompass two years including the paid internship. First, there is no evidence that a direct positive correlation exists between a high undergraduate grade point average and success as a teacher. Second, an additional year of preparation may discourage some otherwise well-qualified persons from becoming teachers. Third, it would greatly reduce the numbers of students in teacher education programs; in fact it probably would force some institutions with limited enrollments to drop teacher education altogether. Fourth, decreasing the pool of newly certificated teachers could prompt school districts to enhance the teacher's role, salary, and working conditions and could therefore result in higher tax levies.

Nevertheless, the advantages of a graduate entry program as the main entry route to the teaching profession far outweigh the disadvantages. The prospective teacher as an undergraduate student could concentrate on becoming an educated person with in-depth knowledge in one or more subject areas. With a graduate entry-level program only, the college of education could concentrate on individualizing the program to strengthen an already mature student with a balance of speciality courses and experiences with field-centered pedagogy. A full-year program with a concentrated focus on professional development, organized by teams of teacher educators, would prepare the prospective teacher up to the internship. During the internship, a supervisory team drawn from the ranks of the teachers themselves and highly skilled university personnel would assist the intern throughout the first year. Successful completion of the internship would result in the issuance of a teaching certificate or license.

Implementation would require careful planning with field teachers, teacher association representatives, and public school officials. The role of the university-based teacher educator would be dramatically changed. Instituting such a program would constitute the first substance change in teacher education since the introduction of baccalaureate degree programs for teacher education during the 1920s and 1930s.

INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION

No matter what inservice education is called or how it is presented, it typically is something planned and organized by a local or intermediate school district and "done" to the classroom teacher. The teachers are examined and judged deficient in certain areas, then solutions are prescribed for them. The resultant activity may be tabulated and documented, but it may not result in improved classroom instruction or improved student learning. Ultimately, all programs of teacher inservice must be examined in light of this crucial issue.

As recently as 20 years ago, teachers were expected to instruct students in a rather basic and stable list of subjects which the teachers had themselves studied and mastered; whereas today nothing is very stable and mastery of a subject seems impossible. It would be logical to change the schools, reorganize the instructional process, and encourage teachers to become specialists--in children and in a subject area. However, team teaching, technology delivery systems, and the like require new approaches to space utilization, new program conceptualization, administrative leadership, and teacher willingness--conditions seemingly impossible to attain. Consequently the typical teacher is still in a self-contained classroom, is surveyor of the whole program while master of too little of it, and needs help. If the schools can't or won't change, then the teacher will have to! It is not very logical, but the pattern seems quite consistent with our bureaucratic approach to a problem.

Although professional development is not new, the current emphasis on it is a recent phenomenon. In the past, inservice education was offered to teachers as a means to introduce them to new programs or classroom materials. Inservice meetings typically were conducted by the area supervisor to meet specific educational needs as defined by the district or school. The biggest departure from this format came with the introduction of modern mathematics in the late 1950s. The task was so monumental and the pressures were so intense that it became necessary to utilize resources previously untapped. Districts contracted with universities to conduct credit and noncredit workshops and classes in modern mathematics, universities offered similar workshops and courses on campus, publishers conducted textbook orientation workshops, and enterprising faculty entrepreneurs formed consulting firms to contract individually with districts. What was exceptional, in terms of the project's magnitude and the resources deployed to meet the challenge of modern mathematics in 1960, became commonplace with the "Great Society" legislation of the 1960s. However, the same philosophy persisted throughout the sixties: the way to improve education is to retrain the teachers in accordance with a "master plan" designed without discussing it with the teachers.

Many of the reforms of the sixties fell by the wayside because inservice programs set out to implement changes with a group of teachers who were never convinced that the changes were needed--or even legitimate. Another form of professional development, conducted by colleges and universities under the banner of graduate degree programs, flourished alongside the programs conducted by school systems. The universities focused on training for new positions rather than broader training to become a more effective classroom teacher. Programs designed to train counselors, reading specialists, curriculum and instructional supervisors, teacher trainers, special education teachers, media and technical personnel, and administrators prospered and fulfilled the personnel needs of rapidly expanding administrative positions. Although it was possible to take a degree with an emphasis on classroom teaching strategies, these programs tended to be a collage and to overlap post-baccalaureate teacher training programs. While the colleges and universities did successfully meet their obligations to individual teachers who wished to train for new positions, they never assumed responsibility for inservice training of classroom teachers as part of their outreach program, except on a grant or contract basis. As a result, the school system programs, staffed with internal appointments from the central office and classroom teaching personnel and supplemented with consultants and freelance entrepreneurs, never met teachers' needs and/or expectations.

A program of professional development can bridge both inservice dimensions and at the same time meet the legitimate desires of teachers to pursue new career goals. Among the legitimate goals and objectives for such a program are:

- Improving the quality of educational services for all students. Appropriate activities include the introduction of a new basal reading series, understanding the metric system, preparation for mainstreaming, learning the use of the school library in enriching the curriculum for talented and gifted students, and other experiences that pertain directly to the classroom program. The primary goal is to improve the educational offering, and it is accomplished by training the teacher in new materials or educating the teacher in new content.

- Increasing the professional competency of teachers. Activities to further this objective include reading and interpreting standardized test results, diagnostic/prescriptive teaching, learning to identify talented and gifted students, studying counseling techniques, and other experiences designed to increase the range of professional skills that are part of the repertoire of the individual teacher. The primary goal is to increase the professional skills of the individual teacher, with the expectation that the educational experiences available to the students will be improved.

- Increasing the professional competency of administrators. If the primary goal of administration is to facilitate and support the classroom instructional process, then a professional development program for administrators is essential. Administrators need an understanding of new curricular programs, new classroom strategies, and new instructional materials if they are to become active members of the school or system instructional leadership team. In addition, administrators need to grow in their understanding of administration, leadership, and change theory and practice. As administrators' understanding of the program is increased, their leadership skills will promote a higher quality of education in each classroom.

Teachers today are much more sophisticated consumers of education, just as public school students have become more sophisticated. Teachers rightfully are demanding a voice in "what is being done to them" in the form of professional development, both because of the previously discussed changes in the teaching staff and because of increased interest in teacher centers. Although proponents proclaimed that centers resolve the questions about organization and teacher involvement, the evidence thus far does not seem to support the conclusion.

Colleges and universities continue to offer courses and programs designed to meet the inservice needs of teachers. New courses in reading, mainstreaming, and similar areas of current emphasis reflect this desire on the part of colleges to meet their obligations. Yet there are still few instances of coordinated efforts to offer assistance in areas identified as priority items by both teachers and school systems. The colleges must rethink the conceptual framework of the programs; revamp the content and methodology; help students develop subspecialties that are related to teaching but not limited to teaching in the public school classroom; and provide students with adequate career and job counseling.

A PLAN FOR MEETING THE FUTURE TODAY

The current literature is replete with descriptions of teacher centers and/or professional development centers. The common viewpoint shared by most of the authors is that colleges of education are unwilling or even unable to contribute to improved classroom practice, and so they should be left out of the process. First of all, the assumption is both false and capricious because colleges of education and their faculty members have contributed to improved classroom practice in the past, and continue to do so today. Second, the charge seems to be based more on "control" than on resources and expertise. It seems impractical to encourage state governments to create a series of degree or non-degree institutions to serve a highly specialized segment of the population, in direct competition with already existing colleges of education. This is especially true now that we have entered an era of tax limitation referendums.

In an attempt to be more responsive to teachers' needs in classroom practice and to improve the practice of teacher education in general, the College of Education at Eastern Michigan University has undertaken three new, bold approaches and one traditional approach to plan and implement changes at all levels of the teacher education programs offered by the College. They are: (a) certificate for advanced study in curriculum and instruction, (b) professional development field centers, (c) campus resource centers, and (d) ongoing program revision.

Certificate for Advanced Study in Curriculum and Instruction

Although there is nothing dramatic about the introduction of a CAS program as part of graduate study, this program is different in the following ways:

--Enrollment is limited to practicing teachers with continuing or permanent certificates.

--A Professional Advisory Board, with a majority consisting of teachers, district supervisory personnel, and association/federation representatives, constitutes a policy board for the program.

--Each student's program is completely individualized, with no required courses.

--Workshops, courses, seminars, and other education experiences are planned as a result of an identified need, and none is to be offered more than twice.

--There is a liberal transfer policy so that other meaningful educational experiences can be evaluated and used as part of the program.

--The emphasis is on nontraditional delivery systems and may include some practical supervisory activity, but is not "district specific."

--The focus of all educational experiences offered or approved under this program is on "improved classroom teaching practice."

The program received approval in Spring 1978 and the first offerings under the program began in October 1978. To date, the 70 prospective student enrollees consist mainly of classroom teachers who have ten or more years of experience and whose career goals are fulfilled in the classroom teacher role.

Professional Development Field Centers

This program utilizes a "teacher center" model but is "district specific" as contrasted to regional or multidistrict centers. To implement the concept, a small executive board--consisting of representatives from the University, including a vice president, and personnel from the local district, intermediate district, and teacher federation/association levels--has been formed. Five local districts have been invited to participate in the program during 1978-79: two as operating partners and three as planning partners. It is anticipated that the three districts that are planning partners during 1978-79 will become operating partners during 1979-80 and that additional districts will be invited to become planning partners. Features of the program include:

- --Each district assigns a professional development coordinator to work with the university personnel.
- --A professional development committee is formed at each school site.
- --The program emphasis is to be on those areas and needs identified by teachers at the building level.
- --Special programs, courses, workshops, and the like are designed for building needs and will consist mainly of one-time offerings.
- --A preservice component is to be one element of each building program.
- --The executive committee will serve in a policy and approval role until a more broadly based committee can be formed.
- --University general funds are distributed to participating districts to cover their costs for personnel involvement.

This program received legislative approval in 1978 and projects the College of Education into a leadership role that was not previously part of the Michigan Plan for Professional Development. It is anticipated that expanded funding for this program will be sought as part of future budget requests.

Campus Resource Centers

Individual staff members as well as clusters of faculty members often represent an invaluable resource for public school teachers in developing program areas. More often than not, these resources are made available on an individual entrepreneurial basis rather than as part of the university's service commitment. In an effort to regularize the access that school districts and individual teachers have to the resources available through the College of Education faculty at Eastern Michigan University, the College is developing program area resource centers. At present, two centers--Community Education and Consumer Education--are well established and serve a statewide clientele. In addition, the reputation of the Community Education Center is such that it serves virtually as a nationwide resource center. The third and fourth centers--Adult Education and Bilingual Education--are in the first and second year of operation respectively. The fifth center--Reading--is in the planning stage, with an implementation date of September 1979; a sixth center--Mathematics and Computers--is in the conceptual stage, with a 1980 date for its anticipated implementation.

Each center has staff members assigned to the program area and is supported primarily with institutional funds, although grant monies supplement these funds. Each center shares the following objectives:

--Center resources are made available to classroom teachers and others in the field.
--Consultant assistance is available to the field on a no-cost or low-cost basis.
--Graduate course offerings in the program areas are available and are accepted in the regular degree programs.
--The major focus is on the improvement of field practice in the program area.

The "center approach" to new program areas as well as those that are in a state of imbalance enables the College of Education to develop the service thrust in such a way that the College becomes an invaluable resource to the field.

Ongoing Program Revision

The graduate programs are reviewed regularly as part of the campus policy of having an internal or external review every five years. Similarly, undergraduate programs are under review and revision, with a revised elementary teacher preparation program due for implementation in 1979, a revised early childhood program in 1980, and a revised secondary and all-grades program in 1981. At the same time, department processes for new course development and course revision are operational to meet the revised program requirements. To meet the multicultural requirement in the NCATE standards, .5 FTEF of one staff member has been assigned to develop the institutional capability in this area.

One of the major demands on faculty as a result of all four efforts is a rethinking of the course development process. In the past, a course was developed and became a permanent fixture of the department or college. The new program effort makes courses consumable goods; items with a short life span designed to meet a specific need. However, this idea has yet to be fully accepted by the faculty or the university curriculum bureaucracy.

In order to fund this reorientation or revitalization process, the University has allocated more than $300,000 for the 1978-79 fiscal year. In addition, approximately 50 percent of the time of the Associate Dean and approximately 30 percent of the Dean's time is devoted to this effort.

In Conclusion. It is becoming apparent that a continuation of past practices will impact dramatically on teacher education and the role of the College of Education will be greatly diminished. The accumulated expertise concerning the "instructional processes" concentrated on education faculties must be redirected into new and visionary areas. Indeed, teacher education is fortunate that the American public still looks toward the school as the major source of learning expertise; it is a compliment to our past successes as well as those of the public school. However, teacher education must be as responsive in training teachers and nonteachers for new and nontraditional roles within society as it has been in meeting staff needs of the elementary and secondary schools in the past.

REFERENCE

Herndon, Terry. "The Future of the Teaching Profession? Elusive. Foreboding." Journal of Teacher Education 29 (4): 29-30; July-August 1978.

THE PURVIEW OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

Frederick B. Bunt

It is time for a change! The education of teachers, educational administrators, supervisors, and other allied professional educators should be conducted with a new mission, an enlarged set of purposes, and a redefinition of content. Graduate schools of education accordingly must reorganize and revamp their structure, design, and functions.

As professional educators we need suggestions for fruitful alternatives; we should be soliciting help from concerned professionals in all fields, not the harebrained schemes of frustrated malcontents. This monograph will not recount the litany of abuses heaped upon teacher education and the training of other educational personnel since the days of the normal school. It is too well known. Even self-flagellation is not an unknown practice in Education--as may be seen in the comments by Dean Daniel Griffiths of New York University on the anti-intellectual character of the professional educator (1973). Perhaps educators are their own worst enemies.

In addition to the manifold cruel and misdirected barbs of the critics, many schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) now face the coup de grace: financial collapse. The SCDE, in many cases, was once the proud provider of funds for the development and operation of improved programs in the arts and sciences and now is labeled the "poor relative," a drain on college or university resources. Subject to a final solution--abandonment or merger (with an arts and sciences department)--many SCDEs must move quickly and decisively in a fruitful direction, one which is economically and pedagogically sound and which does not compromise standards or the profession. The primary thrust of this monograph is to suggest that a reorganization and reconceptualization of graduate programs in education is a fruitful direction in the quest for survival of professional education.

AREAS OF CONCERN

Before providing a series of recommendations for reorganization of graduate professional education, let's take a moment to examine some of the errors professional educators have committed over the past 20-30 years for both good and bad reasons. We have been responsible for SCDEs that accept and promote:

1. Narrow definitions of their responsibilities and purposes
2. Continued acceptance of marginal students and subsequent below-average performance by these students
3. Training and certification of educational non-leaders
4. Overspecialization while ignoring promising multidisciplinary approaches to educational problems
5. An amoral approach to professional education

6. A myopic concentration on knowledge production to the detriment of knowledge utilization.

The following are brief, noncomprehensive explanations of these six "errors" that SCDEs have committed over time.

First, we should admit we committed a cardinal sin in marketing. Teacher education put all of its apples in the public school basket. If we had had any predictive sense at all we would have realized the school population and birth rate would not--could not--continue indefinitely to spiral upward. There are simply too many institutions of higher education involved in teacher education.

Beyond that, we have erred in defining our mission. SCDEs (the undergraduate as well as the graduate levels of operation) should not be relegated solely to the preparation of public (or private) school personnel. Our mission should have been the preparation of educators, of facilitators of learning, of professional helpers in the learning process to function in all kinds of formal and informal environments.

Ducharme and Nash, writing in the Teachers College Record, made a strong plea for the development of human service educators. They defined the human service educator as:

> . . . a helping professional and effective teacher who uses appropriate knowledge, values, and skills, vis-a-vis a variety of face-to-face and group interventions, in order to enable needful persons to realize their human, professional, and political potential so that they might grow in the directions they choose--directions which in the long run are mutually beneficial to the individual and the group, and life-enhancing (1976, p. 443).

Ducharme and Nash are correct in their courageous call to broaden the range of vision of educators beyond mere classroom teaching competence, but they do not go far enough. Of course, human services enlarge the educator's range of professional activity to human relations and life enhancement activities for new populations. But I see the need for graduate programs in education which prepare human service educators and directors of training in business and industry, television teachers, educational managers, writers, technicians, accountants, and a host of others.

SCDEs have failed to examine the relevance of teacher education for a wide variety of fields or occupations. It is our responsibility to determine just what are the parameters for an educator in terms of vocation. Teaching is an act that engages the time and effort of the great majority of the American adult population; there is not a human activity which could not utilize formal instruction in order to improve performance.

Our mission is to serve all who need the assistance of trained educators, including the human services, business, industry, government, armed forces, civil service, and others. The SCDE is selling one extremely complex skill: how to help someone (or some group) to learn, and to learn efficiently and effectively.

Second, in the name of survival too often we accept into our teacher education programs students who, regardless of time and effort, cannot or perhaps will not function on a minimal level of acceptable teacher performance. Of course, there are those whom we select out of teacher education programs; but too many others remain who cannot, for example, write a cogent, grammatically correct paragraph.

Simply compare the SAT scores and high school averages of the entering class of teacher education students with the significantly higher scores of students in the arts and sciences. The gulf between the scores of the two groups is most disheartening.

Third, our screening of students for teacher education and other education-oriented programs suffers from a lack of concern for the societal problems we face as well as for the academic standards we profess. As Cremin indicated in the 19th Annual Hunt Lecture, "I have argued in my recent writings that we have been living through a revolution in education that may be as profound as the original invention of the school" (1978, p. 17). The type of person needed to function as an educator must be a scholar, a learned individual, well acquainted with the arts and sciences and capable of functioning in a rapidly changing social milieu. Cremin said:

> It is a revolution compounded of several elements--the rapid expansion of higher education to a point where one out of every two high school graduates has been going to college; the massive shifts in population, from east to west, from south to north, from country to city, and from city to suburb, which have created new and extraordinary clienteles to educate; the movement of women into paid employment outside the home in unprecedented numbers, with prodigious consequences for the family; the changing character of work associated with the emergence of a postindustrial society, and in particular the growth of the so-called knowledge industries; the various civil rights and liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s, which have so radically changed the management and politics of education (pp. 17-18).

There is no substitute for a literate, well-balanced teacher, aware of and sensitive to social problems, capable of dispassionate problem solving, and motivated toward continued acquisition of knowledge and skill. But the study of specific disciplines and job specialties ought to be secondary to the study of life realities as these relate to the individual and to society as a whole. According to Tyler:

> Our nation must develop a majority of citizens who are conscious of the serious problems our society faces in such matters as the production and use of energy, maintaining a stable population, reducing international tension, maintaining a livable environment, developing a productive world-wide economy, and the like (1978, p. 32).

If Tyler has correctly predicted some of the future demands on our nation, who in the teaching ranks will be prepared to deal with these demands? Will it be today's marginal students, students who have had no advanced study in the field of education and who are the products of a telescoped professional education--in some cases just two, all too brief, undergraduate semesters?

Fourth, preparation of educators must move away from the unidimensional approach which has for so long characterized teacher education. Allen Rosenstein, a professor of engineering, has stated the problem in this way:

Modern society has become so complex and interrelated that all important issues are multiprofessional and in turn require a multiprofessional resolution. Although we educate professionals in an insulated fashion that insures the uniprofessional answer, case after case of uniprofessional solutions to large scale societal problems must in general result in a system disaster (1978, p. 46).

It is the recalcitrant and somewhat suspicious attitude educators have held toward the inclusion of multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to education which has limited and emasculated teacher education programs. We have failed to grasp the comprehensive nature of the teaching act. We have narrowly defined our programs in response to specialization as the means of attaining rewards in our society. The more we train specialists, the less the chance of producing gifted integrationists, or "comprehensionists" to use Buckminster Fuller's term.

In large part, improvement of teacher education programs and the functioning of SCDEs will be possible only if we move toward more comprehensive and interdisciplinary graduate level education programs and organizational structures. We will solve none of the problems we face as educators if we continue to function in a unilateral fashion. All of the important educational problems will require teams of professionals from all disciplines, working toward cooperative solutions, if any real progress is to be made on the improvement of education for the individual as well as society in general.

How can we move toward cross-disciplinary, multiprofessional action on the education front? In the face of a history of half-hearted efforts and poor results, what will impel educators to solicit the thinking and cooperation of other professionals? These questions defy answers, but some suggestions will be made later in this monograph.

Fifth, we have deadened our moral sense and have reluctantly accepted the slogan, "Survival at any cost!" In order to maintain enrollments we have closed our eyes to standards of admission, retention, and graduation, to large size classes, to inservice education by contract, to branch campuses without appropriate facilities, and to the lack of competence and misassignment of faculty. At a time when we need the best possible professional education, we are "winking" at the principles and ethics of our profession.

The preparation of educational administrators is a case in point. To what extent do we really concern ourselves with the moral judgments of educational administrators? What courses or learning experiences deal with the decision-making process and the collective, moral neutrality of organizations? What do we teach about the manipulation of information and the evasion of accountability? "Far too little," many urban minority groups might say when queried about administrative action in their school districts.

Sixth and last, we have not implemented what research and development have told us for over a decade about the preparation of teachers and other education personnel. Our programs do not reflect the new knowledge in:

1. The nature and organization of learning experiences

2. The implementation of knowledge in the professional situation.

We know a good deal about how people learn and what facilitates the learning process. For example, we know that first-hand experience, under guidance and with time for reflection about what happened, is a superior mode for learning teaching skills to vicarious learning experiences. Yet we continue to pursue inadequate and low-quality procedures for training teachers and other education personnel. Practice of teaching skills, for example, is often too short in duration, narrow in scope (kinds of situations, age levels, socioeconomic levels), carried out in isolation from other practicing neophytes, and unobserved by appropriate trainers.

Furthermore, while many SCDEs have been involved in and have contributed heavily to research and development, relatively few have taken the next step: implementation. One serious weakness in teacher education is our inability or unwillingness to utilize the knowledge we have gained.

Perhaps "knowledge" is not the correct term. Davies and Yff, in their article on the explosion of information available for teacher utilization, said:

> There is a tremendous increase in the amount of available information. This information is raw material to be refined and transformed into knowledge, the tool or instrument with which we forge progress. Much of the information presently available to us is still awaiting transformation into useful and relevant knowledge (1976, p. 181).

BUT WHAT IF . . . ?

The six areas of concern listed give rise to a number of proposed directions for teacher educators to follow. These are advanced as hypotheses for testing despite the fact that financial exigencies are hard upon us. It is just those financial, demographic, and societal exigencies which make it imperative that we experiment.

What would happen . . .

If we no longer prepared students for teacher certification on a baccalaureate degree basis?

Isn't it time we realized that more time needs to be spent on the liberal education of the teacher and that only a relatively few education courses should be completed in the undergraduate program? Why can't we insist that all teacher preparational programs be at least a five-year period culminating in the achievement of both the baccalaureate and the master's degree? We have solid evidence to prove the superiority of a two-year post-baccalaureate program (Teacher Corps) over the four-year undergraduate sequence. Graduate schools of education must accept responsibility for the major portion of preservice teacher education.

If we redefined our mission to include the preparation of ALL instructional personnel?

The teaching act is a universal skill which may be applied to a myriad of human services. It is a helping relationship to be used by social service agencies, business, government, and all kinds of educational agencies--not just those labeled "schools." Our task is to prepare individuals, through a wide variety of experiences, to apply knowledge, skill, and emotion intelligently and ethically to the teaching/learning process. Graduate programs in education should accept the responsibility of such preparation and reorganize accordingly.

If we raised our standards?

Would we lose or gain students? In the long run, we would stand to gain by the action. The gain would not be simply in the quality of prospective students--but in the numbers also. The improvement of our image should have a salutary effect on recruitment. Admittedly, some SCDEs might be forced to close their doors; but considering the fact that 93 of the 1367 SCDEs in the United States are housed in colleges that cannot secure regional accreditation, perhaps some closings might be beneficial to the profession.

It has been reported that school boards and school administrators prefer large numbers of licensed teachers from whom to choose. In addition, society seems to promote the concept of easy access to teaching for the underprivileged. Both reasons for producing large numbers of persons for the teaching profession are spurious; they disregard the serious problems our schools face every day in attempting to educate children and youth for the 21st century.

As long as we are raising the standards of performance for students, we should concomitantly raise the standards of performance for faculty and administration. Faculty and administrative development programs and workshops on the improvement of instruction should be an integral part of the contract an employe signs with the institution of higher education. Higher education personnel are just as susceptible to obsolescence as any other human service professionals. And they need prodding--gentle but firm.

One last point is the importance of conducting professional services on an ethical and moral basis. Every program of professional preparation should have specific instances (as well as integration throughout the curriculum) when students study the moral dilemmas of the profession. Time should be given for the study (and even role playing) of professional problems necessitating a moral judgment.

If we greatly extended the training period?

Isn't it time we realized that you cannot produce a first-quality professional in four courses and half a semester of student teaching? Study after study from the field of educational psychology tells us that we cannot mass-produce professionals--that each one must receive individual attention--more akin to the construction of a Rolls-Royce than a Chevy. Such attention must be brought to bear on students at a post-baccalaureate level where concentrated, prolonged study of the field of education is (must be) feasible.

Time-shortened and insulated from field experience, far too many graduate programs (particularly for the master's degree) are emasculated, low-level professional training. Often the M.S. in Education is the financial underpinning for an expensive doctoral program. Little effort is made to individualize training programs and to provide sufficient time for acquisition, mastery, and assessment of prescribed competencies.

Some SCDEs have moved positively toward individualizing programs of professional development. The University of Wisconsin offers a degree program entitled the Professional Development degree. It is a preplanned, committed series of learning experiences which include informal courses (short, noncredit seminars), regular university work at many different institutions, and some work/learning activities. Graduation is based on completing and meeting the contract established with a counselor.

The little we know about adult learning tells us that mature individuals appreciate the opportunity to solve real problems and to take a good deal of personal responsibility for their academic achievement. Why do we continue to treat graduate-level professionals in so many ways like undergraduate students?

If we were to become a model of knowledge utilization?

Davies and Yff noted:

> The discipline of teacher education rests on several of the other social science disciplines including sociology, anthropology, philosophy, and psychology. Thus, the information base of teacher education consists in large part of portions of other information and/or knowledge bases upon which these disciplines rest. There is need for some members of the profession to specialize in the systematic analysis and synthesis of information and knowledge from other social sciences into relevant knowledge for teacher education (1976, p. 181).

Why can't we establish high priorities for the systematic analysis and synthesis of information and knowledge from a variety of disciplines into usable knowledge for teacher education? Possibly because we have not trained our professional educators to do so, nor to see the task as a top priority for the profession.

But even the best known and almost mundane principles for organizing learning experiences are often ignored. For example, to what extent do we utilize "advance organizers" for our programs or even for the individual courses? To what extent are graduate students involved in setting goals or planning learning experiences? Even a cursory examination of graduate (and undergraduate) programs for educators provides evidence of the proliferation of highly suspicious "professional" courses. Little evidence in today's programs of professional education can be found to support the concept of individualized learning experiences for professionals.

If we were to require EXTENDED practice of teaching, administrative, or other educational functions in the real world of education?

Suppose we were to include in the training of the graduate student long-term internships in a variety of settings under careful guidance. Suppose the inservice education of experienced teachers (on the local level) were to be made part of the preservice training for the graduate student. I believe we would greatly improve initial performance of beginning professionals, as well as improve inservice education for all teachers.

The education agency and the SCDE must be sincere, dedicated partners. Beginners, experienced professionals (from a variety of disciplines), university teachers, researchers, developers--all must work together in a problem-solving mode. If the educational and societal problems to be faced by the neophyte are not taught as a cooperative endeavor by many professionals, and not taught in an environment which is a model of multiprofessional cooperation, then we have little hope of making a significant improvement in the American educational enterprise.

If we considered each SCDE faculty member a consultant to educational agencies for the purpose of facilitating action research on teaching, administrative, or other educational problems?

An instructor who teaches four classes (twelve credits) of 20 students per class might possibly teach three classes of 27 students each (nine credits) and utilize the other three credits as time in various educational agencies as an unpaid consultant. The university would not lose; the faculty member would gain invaluable experience; and the agency would receive help that is difficult to secure without the expenditure of significant dollars.

The consulting function of the faculty member is related to the next and final "If," in the sense that it defines the role the university would play in inservice education.

If we let the local education agencies, the teacher centers, and the schools care for inservice education? If SCDEs concentrated on the continuing education of educators for broad, professional certification?

I support the view of Agne and Ducharme (1978, p. 16) that inservice education is employment-oriented education; for instance, site-specific training designed to meet the need of a particular school system or community. The local education authorities determine their needs and design staff development opportunities accordingly.

This kind of educational experience is best accomplished in the local school district, using talented teachers or administrators as instructors. It should be a noncredit learning experience for practicing professionals, and should be unrelated to degree requirements. However, it could be a creditable experience toward meeting the degree requirements for preservice students.

The SCDE's function would be mainly to provide consultant service, perhaps along the line of Agne and Ducharme's "Inservice Education Associates" (p. 18). But education faculty would not teach courses unless they are specifically asked to do so by the teachers involved. Rather, SCDEs would concentrate on providing experienced educators with continuing education that would lead to further professional certification or an advanced degree.

It would be imperative that problems of professional certification be models of knowledge production and utilization, of multiprofessional problem solving, of theory into practice, and of practice that truly engenders confidence and competence in the beginning professional. Such models could not help but raise the standard of performance of the entire profession.

REFERENCES

Agne, Russell M., and Edward R. Ducharme. "Rearranging the Parts: A Modest Proposal for Continuing and Inservice Education." Journal of Teacher Education 28 (2): 16-19; March/April 1977.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Education of the Educating Professions. 19th Annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1978.

Davies, Hopkin M., and Joost Yff. "Information into Knowledge: A Professional's Responsibility." Journal of Teacher Education 27 (2): 181-84; Summer 1976.

Ducharme, Edward R., and Robert J. Nash. "A Futures Perspective on Preparing Educators for the Human Service Society: How To Restore a Sense of Social Purpose to Teacher Education." Teachers College Record 77 (4): 441-71; May 1976.

Griffiths, Daniel. "Intellectualism and Professionalism." New York University Education Quarterly 5 (1): 1-6; Fall 1973.

Rosenstein, Allen B. "Education for the Professions and the Future Quality of National Life." T.H.E. Journal 5 (5): 45-50; September/October 1978.

Tyler, Ralph. "Technological Horizons in Education: An Overview." T.H.E. Journal 5 (5): 32-38, 65; September/October 1978.

AN "UPBEAT" PERSPECTIVE ON GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Vito Perrone

What is the future of graduate programs within schools of education? What ought their directions to be?* While some universal principles may emerge from our collective efforts to reflect on graduate education in this publication, I suspect that our responses will be largely idiosyncratic and will correspond to our particular histories and geographical circumstances. I think a great deal, for example, about graduate education; but my context for that reflection is North Dakota and the University's Center for Teaching and Learning.**

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is a relatively new professional education institution, dating back to 1972. Its name was selected to support a philosophical orientation based on the reciprocity of teaching and learning and on organizational structures which encourage collaboration of faculty members and students across disciplinary fields as well as beyond the confines of a campus. While we haven't achieved all that the institutional name implies to the degree we had hoped, we have established directions that tend to foster ongoing reflection about purpose. This places us, I suspect, in a favorable position to attend to the future thoughtfully and with a sense of optimism.

Other universities may be in a less advantageous situation. At the 1977 AACTE meeting, David Clark described schools of education as defensive and lacking in any significant capacity for renewal.*** While his presentation was not particularly popular, his major thesis is most likely correct. Schools of education typically lack a broad enough base of faculty preparation and experience to address constructively the variety of circumstances that are altering the traditional landscape of education. They tend to lack scholars at a time when scholarship is needed; they lack collaborative experience when collaboration is critical; they maintain a relatively narrow view of education when such a perspective no longer guides the public dialog; they eschew social and public policy as political when politics have begun to dominate educational decision making. CTL was organized at the outset to attend to such concerns.

At the University of North Dakota, we project that enrollments in our graduate programs will grow over the next decade. In part this will occur because recertification standards for elementary and secondary school personnel will multiply and the increasing corps of ancillary personnel required to meet some of the concerns related to PL 94-142 (social workers, psychologists, physical therapists, nurses) will need graduate course work in education to supplement their non-education professional training. To an even larger degree, however, graduate enrollments will grow because we have restructured many of our programs around the current--and what we expect to be future--realities of our culture as well as the changing needs of schools and communities. Space does not permit a full exploration of all of our efforts, but it might be useful to discuss some briefly in the hope that our experiences might be instructive to others.

---

* Most institutions in our society today are struggling for a renewed sense of integrity, coherence, and purpose. This condition is related to the rapidity of change in the society, but it has been given more urgency by the stagnation of our economic and political systems.

** At the Center we have completed within the past year a planning exercise projecting our goals and program direction for the next ten years; hence, many of the issues have already received considerable thought by the Center faculty and related constituents.

*** This speech was published as: David L. Clark. The Real World of the Teacher Educator: A Look to the Near Future. 18th Annual Charles W. Hunt Lecture. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

INSERVICE/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

We have always viewed the ongoing development of professional educators as important, an integral part of our graduate effort; but the need now--and certainly in the foreseeable future--is much more manifest. Conditions that dominated education settings--schools and colleges--between 1950 and 1970, growth (writ large) being the critical base, contributed almost without design to a fresh flow of ideas, materials, curricula. For the litany of reasons too oft-repeated to need recounting here--declining enrollments, teacher supply and demand imbalances, inadequate fiscal support--these conditions no longer prevail. As a result, the concern is that professional school personnel now face a future of limited opportunities to examine differing perspectives about education, engage in active learning, interact with supportive colleagues, become curriculum makers and community educators. Institutions such as ours need to assure that the opportunities are not limited.

The ways in which we have organized inservice/staff development programs to assure that opportunities for growth continue are based on a number of assumptions growing out of our past decade's experience in schools and communities throughout North Dakota. These assumptions should be kept in mind as specific CTL programs are discussed.

- The quality of individuals' understandings influences to a large degree what they do in classrooms.
- The best source for school professionals to learn more about teaching and learning, growth and development of children, materials, and methods is through an examination of their own practice and their own educational settings.
- School professionals are likely to engage in alternative directions if they are involved significantly in defining their own educational problems and needs and if they receive concrete assistance on their own terms.
- In order to overcome their isolation and take fuller responsibility for their own development, school professionals need access to a supportive professional community.

Our Extern Program has been designed to enable practicing teachers and school administrators in North Dakota and western Minnesota to pursue up to eight semester hours (four hours in any single semester) of graduate study that relates directly to an inquiry rooted in their specific educational setting. Persons interested in engaging in the Extern Program will be asked to respond to the following:

- Identify the problem/issue/topic you wish to pursue and provide a brief description.
- List the questions that you have which relate to the problem/issue/topic.
- Outline some initial thoughts of how you might pursue your study.
- How many hours (per week) could you realistically set aside to engage in this study?
- Is there a Center for Teaching and Learning faculty member whom you feel could be particularly helpful in your inquiry? Please identify.

This initial activity is designed to assist practicing professionals to reflect about their work and become more explicit about their intentions in relation to their participation in the Extern Program. Once a CTL faculty member and the extern are matched, a variety of interactive processes are scheduled to begin so that the practicing professional's plans are operationalized. If the extern is remote from the immediate locale of the University--and the program was really designed for such individuals--a resource person in or close to the extern's community will be assigned to meet periodically with the extern throughout the duration of the inquiry. This interaction supplements the CTL faculty member's communication by telephone, letter, and one or two meetings in the extern's setting.

The resource persons are selected from a large reservoir of professionals with whom we have worked intensively over the past decade. Much of this reservoir was built through a four-year (1973-77) NIE Research on Staff Development, but other programs have clearly contributed. I cite the NIE activity in particular because it is typical of our approach to external funds: We seek external support only for activities which can be integrated with our ongoing programs, have a collaborative capacity, and serve our overall goals. We don't develop programs that "tack on" to our ongoing efforts or have a potential for moving us away from our ability to be a major statewide resource.

The Extern Program has potential for doing a number of things: It will be of assistance to the extern and, with the resource person, can provide a basis for building a professional community within various localities in the state. It will also provide a vehicle for keeping CTL faculty in touch with the interests and problems of practicing professionals and, as a result, will assist them in their formal instruction and in establishing their research and service agendas.

The Saturday Workshops are now in their fifth year and typically attract 200-300 teachers and school administrators. The workshops are planned by CTL faculty and practicing professionals; are activity oriented; and relate to curriculum development. During any year these workshops involve some 40 percent of our total faculty. They represent yet another activity that supports the professional growth of practicing school professionals while keeping our faculty intimately associated with practitioners.

These workshops are held on the UND campus and in some off-campus settings where our Teacher Centers (to be described) have not yet been developed. Other activities which are aimed at specific groups and which give support to similar goals are also organized. One particularly successful example is our annual week-long education conference that attracts individuals from many parts of the state, the United States, and Canada.

The Teacher Center Project had its impetus some five years ago when it was becoming clear that we could not possibly meet all of the demands being made on us by practicing professionals in North Dakota. And, of course, we concluded that it would be a mistake to attempt to do so even if we had the resources. Having made that decision, CTL assumed the leadership in organizing a "statewide response to the recognized inservice education/staff development needs of professional educators while maintaining traditional respect for, and support of, local initiative."* By the spring of 1976 a statewide plan involving the state colleges, the University, the State Department of Public Instruction, the North Dakota Education Association, and several school districts had emerged. Operational Centers now exist in Grand Forks, Minot, Mayville, and Devils Lake, with planning activities occurring in Fargo, Bismarck, Valley City, Fort Yates, Dickinson, and Williston. By 1980, Centers should be operational in every geographic region of North Dakota and accessible to almost every practicing teacher and school administrator.

In my meetings with faculty members from a number of colleges of education, I have been astonished at their defensiveness with regard to the development of teacher centers, which are seen as competition, another "nail in the casket." We, on the other hand, view the Centers as valuable resources which are doing much that we think is important. Because they are meeting, on an informal basis, a large share of the inservice interests of teachers, we are in a position to do on a more formal basis what we can do best; namely, provide appropriate theoretical constructs, enlarge the literature, encourage reflection, develop documentation-evaluation directions, organize graduate programs to meet specialized needs, engage in public policy analyses, and so forth.

The Centers are all quite different, adapting their activities to local interests. But they are all richer by virtue of their collaboration, learning from each other, sharing materials and resource personnel. University faculty members maintain their capacity to learn from practitioners through interaction with the Centers. In addition, the Centers encourage the organization of formal graduate courses and are gaining a capacity to facilitate the research interests of faculty members at the University.

What do all of these inservice/staff development efforts have in common? They all are aimed at keeping school professionals--as well as University faculty members--alive intellectually. To that degree they create a fertile base on which to build graduate experiences--whether coherent programs or courses designed for particular purposes.

---

* Proposal to the Bush Foundation, November 1976. p. 1.

PROGRAMS

A number of factors have guided us as we examine our graduate programs with a view toward the future; namely, how do we assure that our programs become more accessible, appropriately serve underserved populations, have capacity to make a *qualitative* difference for those who pursue them, support a collaborative character, and stimulate our faculty and their interests?

Based on geography alone, graduate education programs are less accessible to some individuals in North Dakota than to others. The number of individuals in the state with graduate degrees declines as the distance from the University increases. As the professional education staffs in North Dakota school districts become more stable and older, the difficulties in returning to the University for extensive on-campus study will likely intensify.

Recognizing such conditions, we have begun to organize *extended degree programs* in cooperation with the state colleges. In this respect, the state is becoming our campus. The extended degree programs enable individuals to complete three-quarters or more of their graduate degree coursework in a setting easily accessible to them.*

The extended degree programs provide for one-half of the coursework to be taught by state college faculty members. Therefore, beyond the direct value to persons seeking degrees, the external degree programs enhance interaction among college and university faculties to the benefit of both--a level of cooperation long overdue. We believe this effort has some excellent staff development potential for college and university faculties, and in the years ahead we will seek support for faculty exchanges and more frequent short-term interaction.

Closely related to the intentions of the extended degree programs is our *work-study graduate program*, which permits individuals seeking a master's degree and certification (in Special Education, for example) to maintain their employment and also go to school. During the academic year, these students are on-campus for intensive coursework for two weeks and back in their home settings for six weeks; the cycle continues throughout the academic year. Within their work experience, students' graduate efforts are put into practice and documented.

This direct link between the academic and clinical experiences offers considerable potential for intensifying graduate education at the practitioner level. Seminars occur every other week while the students are in their home settings and serve to reinforce the on-campus academic study. The work-study graduate program at the master's level can be completed in two full summers and two academic year semesters.

This program was designed principally for educational administrators and special educators in the Native American communities, where the demand for persons with additional preparation and credential levels is critical.

---

* Our mode for many years was to offer a wide range of extension courses. While we will continue to offer extension courses in *some* locations, these courses will be designed increasingly around locally identified needs or be tied directly to a coherent degree program effort.

To remove individuals occupying important professional positions for full-time study would not serve these communities well. On the other hand, the communities are quite willing to support a program that improves the preparation of their personnel while not removing them for long periods during the time of year when their services are essential.

In order to accommodate new personnel in schools--nurses, social workers--we have redeveloped one of our programs for the Master of Science degree. The program contains a core of coursework in educational history, sociology, philosophy, and curriculum while maintaining a minor in courses directly related to the student's background (such as nursing or social work). Although we do not view this development to be particularly large, it is an important direction.

In addition to altering the organizational patterns and focus of existing degree programs, we have begun to combine some of our graduate program areas--again to respond to changing needs. Examples are the Early Childhood-Handicapped Program, Multiply Handicapped Program, Secondary Reading, Middle School Education, Early Childhood-Administration, Special Education-Administration, and Program Evaluation. Our broad, integrated structure helps us in responding easily to the need for such program directions. My experience with more traditional patterns--narrow departmental structures and less-than-coherent directions--is that altering degree programs to accommodate cross-disciplinary interests is complex, if not impossible.

In discussing some fresh direction for graduate education in the Center, I have yet to comment on our post-master's degree efforts--partly because the principal demands in our region are likely to continue to be at the master's level or directed toward post-master's level coursework that is not degree oriented. Our Specialist Programs are limited at this time, and relate in part to credential requirements, especially in educational administration. We do not foresee a large expansion of our efforts at this level but may consider developing our service-administration programs (Special Education-Administration, for example) to a larger degree. It might also be an appropriate level for a school psychology program, especially in light of the demands of PL 94-142.

At the doctoral level, our programs historically have been flexible, designed to fulfill the particular interests and directions of our students. This characteristic will continue to make our programs attractive.*

---

* It should be noted that our doctoral programs are not large. We graduate approximately 12-18 doctoral students each year in CTL. Graduates typically accept senior positions in state departments of public instruction, social service agencies, and schools or teaching-research positions in colleges and universities. While the overall needs for persons with doctoral level preparation in education are not likely to expand, there is little to suggest a dramatic decline. The size of our programs, their inherent flexibility, and our location in the upper Great Plains suggest continued stability of our doctoral efforts in the years ahead.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT OUR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Through a focus on the Center for Teaching and Learning, I have attempted in this paper to offer to others a philosophic and programmatic direction that might be useful. Our efforts on behalf of students and program areas are assuming, to a larger degree than ever, a more *defined* purpose. The time is past for generalized, omnibus graduate programs. We are interested in preparing, for example, school administrators *for a purpose*; that is, *the ability to provide educational leadership* in a school. Individuals preparing for positions as Reading Specialists need to be readers themselves, capable of establishing leadership, and not merely responsive to shifts in public moods or publishers' materials. Each of our programs must carry with it a sense of purpose, with individuals who complete the programs capable of articulating that purpose in their own terms.

We remain convinced that professionals in education need to be far *more articulate* about their purposes--why they do *this* rather than something else, why *this* organizational pattern rather than other possible patterns, why *this* set of materials, why *this* approach to reading, why *this* process for curriculum development or evaluation. The graduate programs in which individuals are enrolled should be organized to support such capacities. So, too, should inservice activities that are offered.

It may have been noted that I have not given particular attention to programs for professionals who work outside of fairly traditional education settings; for example, in hospitals, youth centers, business and industry, senior citizens centers, medical schools, or mental health clinics. Our programs have a capacity to serve individuals interested in such directions--and we recognize that these areas are growing in potential--but that is not our primary focus, even as we look to the future. We recognize also that the changing demographic statistics in our country indicate that by the year 2000 some 30 percent of our population will be beyond the age of 60 and that their educational needs will be high. Nevertheless, while we are now increasing our capacity to work with the University's Gerontology Institute and older citizens--and will continue to do so in the next 20 years--this still is not viewed as our *primary* commitment.

We have long believed that education needs to be conceived broadly--occurring, for all individuals, outside of schools to a large degree--but we continue to view *our primary mission as the qualitative improvement of educational practice in schools*. We maintain this commitment inasmuch as we view schools as the long-term vehicle for intentional teaching and learning in our society for the majority of children and young people.

We are aware that many colleges of education have begun to reshape their existence around the broad concept of "human services." That focus seems to me too amorphous, and it has the capacity to move institutions down a path which pursues generalizations applicable to all educational settings, whatever their circumstances. That direction fits a "scientific" ethos with a penchant for seeking universal principles, but it denies what I perceive as a reality in our society; namely, that *we have culture-specific circumstances and needs*.

Another responsibility that governs our thoughts about the future is our relationship to the State Department of Public Instruction, state legislative committees, school boards, and professional associations. We conceive of our programs and our faculty as *major* resources for the development of public policy as it relates to education. Within this framework, it is natural that we are carrying out major school finance studies on behalf of the State Department of Public Instruction and the Legislative Research Council, providing leadership in such activities as statewide assessment, reading improvement and other basic skills programs, and early childhood education. In addition, we consider ourselves responsible for helping to stimulate public discussion of important educational issues, through a wide range of service activities, public lectures, policy statements, monographs, newspaper articles, and journal publications. We have developed our faculty and our programs with such responsibilities clearly in mind.

Many colleges of education, because of their resource base and their more restricted geographic missions, are not in a position to be statewide resources. On the other hand, they have the capacity within their regional areas to be major policy stimulators and resource centers for developing the basis on which policy decisions can be made. I believe they will find, as we have, that as their effort in this arena enlarges, their support base will also enlarge.

A MAJOR INITIATIVE

Educational practice suffers, I believe, from a lack of theoretical constructs about learning that are rooted in practice. This is one reason teacher preparation programs, whether undergraduate or graduate, have such limited impact on practice. Accepting this critique suggests the need for improving the quality of description which is embedded in classrooms and schools. And to improve the quality of description, it is critical that qualitative, rather than quantitative, research methodologies be given more attention in graduate programs.

We, like others, have given excessive support to a world view of educational research and evaluation that is conceptualized in terms of a treatment-outcome or input-output model. In this particular paradigm, social and historical contexts, program aspects, and individuals' lives are treated as "variables" or "factors" to be interpreted through a range of statistical manipulations; reliability rather than validity is stressed; and control, concern about decreasing variability in teacher-child responses, program implementation, and instructional materials assume paramount importance. Such a paradigm, while having some use, has added little to our cumulative wisdom nor has it given constructive direction to teachers and school administrators. The alternative methodology to which we need to give greater attention in our programs as we look ahead is rooted in observation, descriptive analysis, and phenomenological inquiry--processes designed to get close to data in order to establish meaning.

How does one implement successfully such a direction? How can one get close to a classroom or a school to learn more about the variety of ways that children come to reading; how children respond to or extend the use of classroom materials; how children use particular language; what processes children go through in problem solving; the degree of continuity that occurs in children's patterns of learning; why, when, and how teachers do what they do? From my perspective, the only productive route we have is through collaboration with school professionals, a collaboration that needs to be at the very heart of much of what we do in a graduate program in education.

CONCLUSION

It should be clear that we are optimistic about the future, expecting not just to survive but to thrive. While saying that, I am aware that many schools of education are in less favorable positions, in situations where survival depends almost entirely on enrollments and where pressures for cutting staff and programs are intense. Some of these institutions may well have little more to contribute to the broad field of teacher education and should now go out of existence. But a place remains, it seems to me, for a very large number--especially those capable of reorienting their missions and their modes of operations--to respond to specific circumstances within their natural service-constituent areas.

My reasons for stressing the specificity of mission and modes of operation grow out of a sense that teacher education programs have for too long been undifferentiated--one institution much like another. Such similarity may have been acceptable when teacher shortages existed and teacher education institutions were not being pressed about the quality of their endeavors. But the context--socially, politically, economically, and educationally--is now radically different.

As institutions begin to take on a more specific character, as individuals within institutions become more articulate about their purposes in relation to the institution's specific character, survival becomes easier to support. Competitiveness *between* institutions--a legacy with which all of us live--can be replaced by cooperation.

Does state and federal policy need to change to support the maintenance of schools of education as major resource bases in our society? I believe so; but before that occurs, a better case must be made for what schools of education can contribute to the qualitative improvements of schools and to increased knowledge about learning.

I believe the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of North Dakota is a unique institution and an important North Dakota resource. While it would be naive to suggest that our future is *absolutely* secure, we are confident about our capacity to remain a vital and dynamic institution.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE AND THE REFORM OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Daniel E. Griffiths

What is it that is really wrong with teacher education in America? If one is to believe the critics, the answer is "everything." They speak of the dullness, banality, and irrelevance of so-called methods courses. They note the low-level ability of teacher education students and the ignorance of their professors. They remark on the lack of substance in professional education courses, and, finally, they come down to the point that no one needs any special preparation anyway--at least nothing in addition to a thorough knowledge of the subject to be taught, and possibly student teaching.

TIDES OF TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM

Cries for the reform of every aspect of education have become so commonplace that they now rouse little interest--perhaps not only because the redundancy of the cries leads one to disbelieve the warnings, but because the latest reform movement already has begun to recede. Katz came to this conclusion, using as an indicator the re-emergence of the role of heredity in discussions of educational achievement. He speculated, "Generally speaking, environmentalism has been optimistic and hence characteristic of moments of reform. Thus, it dominated reform thought in the 1840's and surfaced again at the end of the century and in the early 1960's" (Katz, 1971, pp. 342-43). Very probably Katz is correct, since the reformers have had little influence on the organization or substance of education.

Yet having said that, one is immediately reminded that some of the reform efforts have been successful, and even a brief examination of these successes provides the clues for additional successes. Certainly one cannot say that curriculum reform in secondary school science and mathematics has not met with success. Without question, instruction in these two areas is very different--and much better--than it was in the early fifties. The reasons appear to be: (a) a new substance, an actual change in the content of what is taught; (b) a codification of the substance so as to make it teachable; (c) materials for students and teachers; and (d) retraining of teachers.

Efforts to reform teacher education have been in marked contrast to the successes in the scientific subjects, and it would be unfortunate if concern for the reform of teacher education slackened off at this time. Little interest in the creation of a new knowledge base has been evinced. Rather, there has been an all-consuming conviction that someone has the answer, if only that person could be discovered; and/or there has been a passion for fiddling with process (Clark and Guba, 1979). Even such well-informed reformists as Don Davies can be indicted on one count. In discussing efforts to reform American education, he said, "Most efforts directed toward such a reformation fail because they focus on input rather than output, on process instead of performance" (Davies, 1970, p. 46). He praised the Career Opportunity Program (COP) because a major goal of that program is "to put the teacher in a position to reorder his time, reduce the number of children who require his personal attention, and concentrate on his real job--diagnosing and prescribing for learning" (p. 42). He did mention *Teachers for the Real World* (Smith et al., 1969) and the fact that it ". . . challenges colleges and universities to develop a systematic body of information, including audiovisual material, that will help prospective teachers analyze their behavior and interpret situations" (p. 43). But he then dropped that discussion and proceeded to enumerate the variety of structural arrangements the U.S. Office of Education will support in the belief that they will change teachers and improve education.

To assume that teachers now know how to diagnose and prescribe for learning and would do it if they only had the time is naive and misses the problem entirely. Teachers now do what they do because it is *all* they know how to do. In fact no one knows how to "diagnose and prescribe for learning," and that is basically what is wrong with teacher education.

Somewhat the same analysis can be applied to Silberman, for he too feels that someone knows the answer and that the answer is largely to be found in changing the processes of teacher education. One finds it difficult not to agree with some of what Silberman has to say; after all, he says so much. And a great deal is contradictory, so the reader has to agree with at least half! For example, he stated, "In short, the weakness of teacher education is the weakness of liberal education as a whole; if teachers are educated badly, that is to say, it is in large measure because almost everyone else is educated badly, too" (Silberman, 1970, pp. 380-81). But then he quoted, approvingly, E. Alden Dunham of the Carnegie Foundation as saying, "The academic revolution has brought with it much that is undesirable, but it has also made American scholarship second to none" (p. 514)--a rather creditable achievement for a crummy educational system!

In terms of this paper, one must agree with the thesis of Silberman's chapter, "The Teacher as Student," which appears to be: "What is wrong with teacher education, in short, is less that too much time is devoted to 'how to' courses than that the 'how to' courses do not teach anyone how to do anything, except perhaps bore a class of students" (p. 444). This is indeed precisely what is wrong with teacher education, and no one should ever deny it. But, then, Silberman presumes to have answers for teacher education. The answer appears to be:

> The central task of teacher education, therefore, is to provide teachers with a sense of purpose, or, if you will, a philosophy of education. This means developing teachers' ability and their desire to think seriously, deeply, and continuously about the purposes and consequences of what they do--about the ways in which their curriculum and teaching methods, classroom and school organization, testing and grading procedures, affect purpose and are affected by it (p. 472).

In short, teachers should be students of teaching. Surely no one can argue with the intent of this statement. The trouble is that, in and of itself, it is meaningless, as becomes clear with Silberman's description of "the most excitng teacher education program in the United States" (p. 473). After a wildly enthusiastic and uncritical exposition of the program at the University of North Dakota's New School for Behavioral Studies in Education, he says of their graduates, "but they are not 'students of teaching'" (p. 479). Why is this so? Silberman does not tell us in so many words, but it is clear from the description (and Silberman *is* a good reporter) that the New School program is built on process, not substance. It is based on the idea that teacher education students should be put into public schools for a long period of time, one year, and that the program should be very practical. Further, it is based on the idea that subject matter and methodology should be blended in the students' university work. Thus, the New School program is a throwback to the old and thoroughly discredited normal school with its courses in English for Teachers, Arithmetic for Teachers, and so on, and a long period of practice teaching. No doubt the New School does it better than the normal school, but it is still a process change, and with this type of program its students can never be "students of teaching."

One cannot leave Silberman and his naive faith in philosophers of education without the comment that if we wait for purpose to emerge from present-day descendants of John Dewey, we will wait till hell freezes over. For modern philosophers concern themselves not with building systems of thought that might give rise to purposes for teachers, but rather with analysis--which never has helped teachers develop purpose, nor never will. What the critics never understand is that while many are right in their analyses, they do not comprehend the conclusions to which their analyses should point. There is little substance in modern-day teacher education, be it graduate or undergraduate. A substance must be built, and this is a very difficult task. The fact that it is so difficult is one of the major reasons more has not been accomplished. Too many abortive efforts to improve teacher education have concentrated on presumably quick and easy approaches such as putting teacher education into the public schools, paying academic professors to talk with educationists, or (the most popular method) berating professors of education.

Smith et al. put the charge for teacher education rather elegantly when they distinguished between teachers with theoretical training and those without:

> One of the chief differences between a teacher who is theoretically-trained and one who is not is that the theoretically-trained teacher will perform with a set of sophisticated concepts taken from the underlying disciplines of pedagogy as well as the pedagogical field itself. The teacher who is not theoretically-trained will interpret events and objects in terms of common sense concepts that have come from the experience of the race permeated with outmoded ideas about human behavior (Smith et al., 1969, p. 45).

Unfortunately, Smith and his associates also fall far short of their own challenge. While it is true that teachers must be trained to perform with a set of sophisticated concepts, the hard question is, what are the sophisticated concepts? It is to that question that the remainder of this paper is devoted.

SOURCES OF NEW SUBSTANCE

There are at least four major sources of new substance for professional education. Since education is concerned basically with developing certain kinds of behavior and discouraging other types, the chief source of information would be the behavioral sciences (psychology, sociology, mathematical statistics, anthropology, economics, and philosophy). A reserve little used in this nation is the research and experience of other countries, generally called comparative education. Probably most of what is known about education today comes from the experience of practitioners and should be examined under the heading of distilled wisdom. The fourth source is, of course, educational research.

While it is true that most of the world studies American education, most Americans are abysmally ignorant of education in other countries. This has led to parochialism so severe as to be laughable. New York struggles with decentralization, for instance, though London for many years has had a very workable decentralized school system. Most of the European countries have solved the problems of support for private and parochial education. And it should be noted that Congressman John Brademas visited West Berlin to study the Max Planck Pedagogic Center as a model for the U.S. National Institute of Education. The solutions to a great many of America's social problems, including education, are known in foreign countries. When will American educators find out about them?

Further, schools of education must somehow find a way to use the experience and understanding of the two million or more teachers, administrators, and specialists who staff the schools. No other profession has such a large number of practitioners, and no other profession has such a need to develop means of acquiring the insights and solutions that their members possess.

A number of recent researchers have contributed valuable knowledge for teacher educators. Bloom's review of almost 1000 studies of selected human characteristics pointed up the tremendous importance of early education; the significance of his work has been reflected in Head Start, in the interest in nursery school and kindergarten education, and in a revival of concern for primary education. Guilford's work on the "structure of the intellect" has led to the idea that learning is the discovery of information, not merely the formation of associations. Suppes' research on principles of learning utilizing advanced computer technology promises to open up new vistas for teacher educators. The effects of the environment on the development of individuals have been explored by Martin and Cynthia Deutsch in Harlem schools, with the result that reading scores of deprived children have been substantially improved. Clearly, research in the past twenty years indicates that, with sufficient support, a knowledge base that will significantly change teacher education in the future can be established.

There is some overlap among the four sources, particularly between behavioral sciences and educational research; for, as Travers (1971) has pointed out, ". . . it is the goal of educational research to build a science of behavior in educational situations, much as chemical engineering is a science of chemistry in industrial production operations." Gage developed this argument first by examining in detail the research on teaching, and concluded that normal science will proceed--"that is, investigators will follow the elaborated process-product paradigm and work on cleaning up an enormous number of details in the unfinished business of the field" (Gage, 1978, p. 93). While all the categories of potential new knowledge should be fully developed, this paper deals only with the behavioral sciences. A full exploitation of the behavioral sciences might also improve the possibilities of exploiting the other sources, particularly educational research.

Since the behavioral sciences are concerned with the development of systematic knowledge of individual and social behavior, many of the concepts, generalizations, and methods of inquiry can, in Tyler's words, ". . . be used to provide an intellectual base for understanding learning and teaching in the school and for planning appropriate learning activities" (Tyler, 1962). It is true that over the years courses in methodology, problems of elementary or secondary schools, and the like which draw on the behavioral sciences have been developed, but in a way that is far short of optimal. As Wallen and Travers put it:

> While here and there one can discern some inroad of scientific knowledge as, for example, in the use of controlled vocabularies, most prescribed teaching patterns have been influenced much more by philosophical traditions, cultural traditions, the needs of teachers and of professors of education, and so forth, than they have been influenced by research on learning (Wallen and Travers, 1963, p. 464).

Further, research on teaching has not provided a base, even if one wanted to use it. Gage pointed out:

> In recent decades, such research has lost touch with the behavioral sciences. It has not drawn enough nourishment for theoretical and methodological developments in psychology, sociology, and anthropology (Gage, 1963, "Preface").

It is reasonable to ask why the education of teachers has strayed so far from its logical base, the behavioral sciences. Some reasons are very obvious and have to do with such simple points as the fact that schools of education do not employ behavioral scientists as professors. Other factors are less obvious; one of these was discussed by Wallen and Travers. They contended, and rightly so, that educationists have tended to choose from the social sciences those elements that fit their particular philosophical bias. This has led to widespread acceptance of Gestalt psychology, for instance, to the exclusion of those aspects of the science of learning which have value for teachers. Wallen and Travers concluded:

> The misfortune is that the discoveries of the Gestalt psychologists provide little of value in the design of teaching methods. As a matter of fact, of all approaches to problems of learning, Gestalt psychology has the least to say about the way in which learning conditions should be manipulated if learning is to occur with maximum effectiveness (Wallen and Travers, 1963, p. 465).

It would seem that when educationists got to the race track they bet on the wrong horse.

One further hunch might explain the present situation. There appears to be little interest and/or aptitude for quantitative method among educationists generally. At New York University, for instance, those who matriculate for the doctoral degree in the School of Education, Health, Nursing, and Arts Professions score rather well on the verbal test of the Graduate Record Examination, but are about two-thirds of a standard deviation lower on the quantitative test (Verbal--600, Quantitative--537). If this condition is general, it may explain the popularity among educationists of such nonquantitative aspects of the social sciences as psychoanalysis, Rorschach tests, and much of the work on personality and culture. Inasmuch as five-sixths of all of the major advances in the behavioral sciences since 1930 have been quantitative in nature, the lack of quantitative ability may be a contributing factor in the paucity of behavioral science sophistication (Deutsch, Platt, and Senghaas, 1971, p. 457).

Whatever the reasons may be for the lack of impact of the behavioral sciences on teacher education, the results are quite clear and account for much of the failure of teachers to produce learning at a uniformly high level.

DERIVING CONCEPTS

Travers suggested that, "The technical language that a sophisticated educational research enterprise must evolve can be partly derived from the related behavioral sciences . . ." (Travers, 1971). He was led to this conclusion by the failure of studies using common language variables, studies he characterized as being "logically well-constructed experiments with weak variables." Educational researchers tend to perform this way, Travers contended, because their formal training is so little related to the behavioral sciences. He maintained further that educational researchers are prone to use common language variables a priori and thus set up experiments to try to demonstrate their value.

The experimental process should be the opposite; that is, experiments on learning should be devised and concepts derived to explain the results. Piaget is noted as one who has done this, with the result that his concepts (such as conservation, transitivity) are certainly not common language; moreover, they have proved very useful. Travers seems to be saying that educational researchers must turn toward the behavioral sciences for concepts which will serve as significant variables and that, in addition, a different orientation to experimentation will emerge. I am quite in agreement with Travers' suggestion. The place to start is with significant social science concepts and with statements of relationships among concepts which might serve as variables for experimentation.

THE NATURE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

It should be clear by now that the terms "teacher education" and "professional education" are used interchangeably in this paper. This not only derives from practice, but is also sensible and logical. The route to administrative and specialized positions in education is almost exclusively from teaching posts to positions outside the classroom. Graduate programs at the master's level produce teachers with "permanent" or "regular" certification, while sixth-year and doctoral programs produce administrators, curriculum specialists, researchers, and the like. Undergraduate study is generally differentiated from graduate in that it includes student teaching, the subject matter one is to teach, and introductory courses in pedagogy. There are, of course, variations on this theme so that many take a liberal arts baccalaureate and then a master's degree which includes all the pedagogy and student teaching that others have taken as undergraduates.

It is no wonder the critics are confused! If professional education had a structure comparable to other standard disciplines, one could comfortably define the introductory work as undergraduate, and advanced work as graduate. This paper will proceed as though that is the case in professional education. It presents an approach to the development of concepts which can, and should, be used at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. At the undergraduate level the student would be introduced to certain intellectual skills, and at the graduate level would learn their application to such practical uses as operant conditioning and learning. The concepts discussed would serve as the basis for a structure of teacher education, but would be differentiated between introductory and advanced for undergraduate and graduate students respectively.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE CONCEPTS AND RELATIONSHIPS

Certainly there are many ways of categorizing what goes on, or what should go on, in teacher education programs. B. O. Smith, for instance, believes there are four major aspects:

1. Training in skills
2. Teaching of pedagogical concepts and principles
3. Developing relevant attitudes
4. Teaching the various subject matters of instruction (1971, p. 2).

This paper is not concerned with his fourth category; not because it is not important or significant--as it most certainly is--but because the concern is with the professional education component. To the three remaining categories, however, must be added a fourth: intellectual skills. These are the skills a teacher needs to understand the behavior of students, other teachers, administrators, and others who relate to the school.

Smith's category "skills" is defined here to mean classroom skills such as lecturing, questioning, discussing, drilling, grouping students for instruction, lesson planning, resolving pupil conflict situations, and materials development. The content of the "pedagogical concepts and principles" category should be obvious. The meaning of "relevant attitudes" is not at all clear (Loree, 1971), though there is some agreement that teachers should be conscious of cultural differences; disposed toward self-realization, self-development, self-evaluation; receptive to change; accepting of students; and illustrative of what Ivey and Houston call "clinical behavior style" (Loree, 1971, p. 102). The category "intellectual skills" denotes what a teacher should know in order to understand the society and the people who live in it, the mental tools necessary to comprehend what social scientists are doing and saying.

In summary, a teacher education program should develop in its students:

1. An ability to master classroom skills
2. An understanding of pedagogical concepts and principles
3. A disposition toward internalizing certain attitudes
4. An ability to use certain intellectual skills.

The behavioral sciences have much to offer a program designed to attain these objectives. (This is not to say that the behavioral sciences are the only source of information bearing on the objectives; rather, they are a necessary but not sufficient source.) A definitive categorization of behavioral science research in terms of the objectives is beyond my ability; what follows merely suggests the possibilities and should be viewed as tentative pending research using the findings in educational settings. The approach followed was to categorize the appropriate leading achievements in social science from Deutsch, Platt, and Senghaas (1971), according to the four objectives of teacher education discussed. Each achievement is actually a line of inquiry, knowledge of which should lead the student to a better understanding of the objectives.

I. An ability to master classroom skills:
   - Sociometry and sociograms
   - Conditioned response
   - Operations research and systems analysis
   - Conflict theory and variable sum games
   - Game theory

II. An understanding of pedagogical concepts and principles:
   - Pragmatic and behavioral psychology
   - Learning theory
   - Intelligence tests
   - Projective tests
   - Culture and personality and comparative child rearing
   - Laboratory study of small groups
   - Operant conditioning and learning; teaching machines

III. A disposition toward internalizing certain attitudes:
   - Theory and measurement of social inequities
   - Sociology of bureaucracy, culture, and values
   - Psychoanalysis and depth psychology
   - Gradual social transformation
   - Elite studies
   - Unity of logic and mathematics
   - Role of innovation in social change
   - Gestalt psychology
   - Large-scale nonviolent political action
   - Functionalist anthropology and sociology
   - Community studies
   - Authoritarian personality and family structure
   - General systems analysis

IV. An ability to use certain intellectual skills:
   - Correlational analysis and social theory
   - Factor analysis
   - Structural linguistics
   - Large-scale sampling in social research
   - Content analysis
   - Scaling theory
   - Model building
   - Computer simulation
   - Stochastic models of social processes
   - Sociology of knowledge and science
   - Operational definitions
   - Attitude survey and opinion polling
   - Information theory, cybernetics, and feedback systems
   - Cost-benefit analysis (planned programming and budgeting)
   - Multivariate analysis linked to social theory.

DISCUSSION

Most of the social science research findings are in the attitude development and intellectual skills categories; by far the fewest are in classroom skills and pedagogical concepts and principles. It would appear that the chief value to educators of the behavioral sciences lies not in direct but in indirect applications. This, most likely, was what Kenneth Clark had in mind when he characterized teachers as "behavioral science illiterates" because they do not now have the background against which to understand their students or the society in which they live.

The presumption of the general, background value of the behavioral sciences leads to the recommendation that teacher education might well follow medicine in its training pattern. Prospective teachers should take a liberal arts program majoring in the subject they wish to teach while minoring in pre-education. The "pre-ed" would acquaint them with research findings in categories III and IV. The fifth year or master's degree course of study would be professional education, with classroom work based on a new substance derived from behavioral science knowledge in categories I and II. The remainder of the year would be spent in practice teaching, with supplemental work in special methods and skill training.

Such a teacher education program would differ from present practice largely because it would deal with a different substance. But before a behavioral science based teacher education program can be introduced, it will be necessary to convert behavioral science research findings into a form that can be used with teachers. In other words, knowledge must be codified or converted into materials or tools. Teachers, both pre- and inservice, can then be taught to use them.

Gage made the most persuasive argument for this approach. He pointed out that, "Other professions give their practitioners whole arrays of techniques, instruments, tools, devices, formulas, strategies, tactics, algorithms, and tricks of the trade" (Gage, 1971, p. 36). He is not talking about barbers or plumbers, but rather engineers, physicians, and lawyers, all of whom have their tools which enable them to perform at a high level. But teachers are expected to develop their own aids: to take research findings and convert them into classroom materials. Since most teachers are, and apparently will continue to be, rather ordinary persons, they need far more "tools of the trade" than are now available. As Gage noted, "What teachers need is a reduced demand for arcane insight and creativity and a greater supply of mundane tools" (p. 36). The behavioral sciences provide the basis for the development of the teacher's tools just as the physical and biological sciences provide the stuff from which the physician's tools are wrought. The "tools of the trade" approach is particularly useful for the classroom skills component of the teacher's work and for the application of pedagogical concepts and principles by the teacher in the classroom. It is less appropriate for teaching attitudes and intellectual skills.

Classroom Skills

One of the lines of inquiry that is beginning to offer insight of a very practical nature to teachers is the application of sociometry to the classroom. Sommer (1967) has devised some interesting experiments to determine the relationships between seating arrangements in college classrooms and student participation. He considers his study to be subsumed under proxemics, the study of how man structures microspace, but he prefers the term "group ecology." Sommer found that in seminar seating arrangements the students directly opposite the instructor participated more than those to the sides; and in classrooms with straight rows students in front participated more than those in the back, and the students in the center more than those to the sides. He concluded that there is no "single best" arrangement for all classroom tasks, but that the instructor should be taught to use classrooms to their maximum effectiveness.

The implication one could draw from this study is that a classroom ecology guide could be prepared for teachers. This and subsequent studies could provide the basis for informing teachers about the most efficient way of seating students to attain particular objectives. It is suggested that graduate courses for students should be based on studies of this type.

Pedagogical Concepts and Principles

It has been noted that many psychologists consider operant conditioning to be the most fruitful for teachers of the various types of psychology. In investigating his "tools of the trade" idea Gage developed a manual, How To Explain, which he then tested in an experiment with two groups of teacher trainees. The manual presented some relatively simple rules for explaining. The trainees, working in teams of two, utilized tape recorders. After one member practiced a step, the other criticized and discussed the performance. Pre- and post-test results indicated that the experimental group was substantially superior to the control group in its ability to explain (Gage, 1971, pp. 46-48). Gage described his manual as a tool which can improve teacher behavior, although he is appropriately cautious concerning its success.

Internalizing Attitudes

It is essential that teachers internalize certain attitudes so they can be effective interpreters of modern society to their students. One set of quite useful attitudes is found in general systems analysis, which grew out of the work of such men as von Bertalanffy, Rashevsky, Rapoport, Miller, and Boulding between the years 1936 and 1956. Application of this line of inquiry requires thinking in systems; that is, identifying all of the related and significant variables or objects needed to understand an event.

On a very elementary level, consider the attempt of one teacher to demonstrate to her class an approach to eliminating pollution by cutting the amount of waste paper generated by their school from thirteen pounds per week to two pounds. She did this by having the students use slates and chalk rather than paper. She apparently never considered that as the children covered themselves with chalk, their mothers washed more clothes, used more detergents, and released more phosphates into the environment.

The story introduces, along with the notion of systems theory, the related components of systems analysis and systems simulation. The chief benefit of the study of these topics should be that educators learn to think in terms of systems. Thus, it would have occurred to the teacher that the environment is a system and that even a single change in one component results in changes in other components.

Intellectual Skills

It would be a rare teacher indeed who was able to acquire all of the intellectual skills listed. In fact, many competent social scientists do not possess all of them. These skills are itemized for a different purpose: they indicate the nature of the intellectual skills a teacher should have to understand the research and writing in the social sciences that directly affect education. For example, many studies pursued over a long period of time correlate IQ with social class, with race, and with urban-rural differences. Many teachers, not understanding correlation, assume that living in a rural area causes a child to have a lower IQ than an urban child, that being Black is the reason a child may have a lower IQ, or that being upper middle class causes the child to have a higher IQ. The fact that correlation is not causation escapes many teachers, with the result that attitudes are built on a faulty interpretation.

Failure at least to appreciate the power of multivariate analysis in relation to social theory leads many teachers (among others) to think of classroom situations in terms of single variables rather than as outcomes of the interaction of numerous variables. The teacher who thinks and acts as if the behavior of a student is caused by a single factor is going to be quite unsuccessful in attempts to change that behavior.

CONCLUSION

I have attempted to demonstrate one approach to the reform of teacher education: the application of behavioral science methodology and knowledge to the preparation of teachers. It seems quite clear that teacher education is relatively lacking in content, but that it need not remain so. Much is known of how and why human beings behave the way they do; Deutsch et al. noted, "Today, statements such as 'we know no more about human psychology and politics than Aristotle did' mainly express the ignorance of those who utter them" (Deutsch, Platt, and Senghaas, 1971, p. 455). This knowledge of people's behavior in general must be applied to human behavior in educational situations. The behavioral sciences suggest the variables and the methodology for a massive research enterprise which might well result in a valid and relevant knowledge base for teacher education. Some of the behavioral science research such as that in operant conditioning can be used with little or no further validation, but most must be tested to determine its use in educational situations; however, the behavioral sciences are a major key to the reform of teacher education.

REFERENCES

Clark, David, and Egon Guba. In: Daniel E. Griffiths and Donald McCarty, eds. The Dilemma of the Deanship. Danville, Ill.: Interstate, 1979.

Davies, Don. "Come Out From Under the Ivy." In: The Best of American Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1970.

Deutsch, Karl W., John Platt, and Dieter Senghaas. "Conditions Favoring Major Advances in Social Science." Science 171: 450-59; February 5, 1971.

Gage, N. L. The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Gage, N. L. "A Tool-Development Strategy for Research on Teaching." In: How Teachers Make a Difference. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1971. pp. 32-50.

Gage, N. L., ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1963.

Katz, Michael B. "The Present Moment in Educational Reform." Harvard Educational Review 41 (3): 342-43; August 1971.

Loree, M. Ray. "Shaping Teachers' Attitudes." In: B. O. Smith, ed. Research in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971. pp. 99-118.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Smith, B. O., et al. Teachers for the Real World. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Smith, B. Othanel, ed. Research in Teacher Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Sommer, Robert. "Classroom Ecology." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 3 (4): 489-503; 1967.

Travers, R. M. W. "The Limitation of Variables Derived from Common Languages." Cassette recording, American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, March 1971.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Applications of the Behavioral Sciences." In: Elmer R. Smith, ed. Teacher Education: A Reappraisal. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Wallen, Norman E., and Robert M. W. Travers. "Analysis and Investigation of Teaching Methods." In: N. L. Gage, ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1963.

THE CONTEXT OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

Kevin Ryan

Organizational theorists tell us that the driving purpose of organizations is to perpetuate themselves, to survive and grow as entities. There is little to suggest that colleges of education and their graduate programs are not driven by these self-survival motives. While this may discomfit those of us who like to believe we are doing the Lord's (or society's) work, it may help explain much of our individual and corporate behavior.

In the long run, however, self-survival--if not self-respect--rests surely on what institutions do, what they contribute to the commonweal. Repeatedly throughout these essays, the authors have stressed that higher education, and particularly graduate education, is in a perilous and uncertain period. Given the current economic situation in the country and the graying climate for support of education, it could be said that training in professional education is an overbuilt industry. Individuals and units within overbuilt industries often do foolish things in response to their situations. Concerns for short-term growth or possible survival may stampede program planners into actions that are either unwise or detrimental. We may be tempted to be too many things for too many potential "customers." Or, on the other hand, we may be tempted to ignore the current economic realities in the educational climate and stick to business as usual.

This essay focuses on the context of graduate programs in education, rather than on the graduate programs in education per se. In effect, this essay will explore what role or roles higher education can play in the continued development of education professionals. Said another way: What can universities and professors do for schools and teachers?

THE ROLES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

There are several ways to approach the issue of the roles of higher education. Perhaps the most direct is to look at what the reward structure in higher education is said to be based on. The institution is expected and supported by society to teach, to research, and to provide certain service roles to the commmunity. Professors, in turn, are promoted and are given salary increases and honors on the basis of their performance of teaching, research, and service. While different institutions place a greater or lesser emphasis on each of the three areas, nevertheless all three are part of the criteria of judgment of institutions involved in graduate programs in education.

Teaching[1]

It is widely assumed that teachers enter their profession undertrained. Their preservice training, when compared with most other professional and vocational preparation on their campus, is typically brief, of low intensity, and provided by the institution on the cheap. Teachers in service, therefore, have high needs for continuing education. The individual teacher's needs for inservice education can be satisfied in numerous ways; however, the university seems uniquely suited to help in four ways.

---

[1] An early draft of this section appeared in a paper entitled "How Can the Professor Help the Teacher?" presented to the National Council of States on Inservice Education, New Orleans, La., November 18, 1976.

First, many teachers need a knowledge possessed by arts and sciences faculties. Just recently, a colleague reported about a high school history teacher with a social studies license who, after a long period of service, was reassigned within her school district in order to desegregate the schools. In her new position, she was required to teach geography for the first time. She had never taken a geography course in her preservice training. And she turned to the university for help. There are many other examples: the English teacher who wants a course in advanced composition, or the primary teacher who needs to know about reading disabilities.

Second, many teachers feel the need for advanced methods courses where new content in their field (or at their grade level) can be learned along with the appropriate methodology. This speaks, of course, to the dynamic nature of education and the professional's need to keep abreast of developments.

Third, new areas of professional competence are being required of teachers. Some may feel the need to learn more about working with the mentally or physically handicapped. Others may wish to learn how to use educational media more effectively in their classrooms. Still others may seek to understand more fully their role in the moral education of children.

Fourth, there are those teachers who seek new roles within education, such as counseling, library work, or administration.

In all four of these teaching-related functions, the university has highly trained people ready to help the teachers acquire new knowledge and skills.

While teachers have needs, this is not to suggest that the university is the only means of solution, nor that the university faculty members in and out of the college or department of education are the only ones who can provide the professional expertise necessary to respond to these needs. It seems reasonable that higher education institutions should ensure that the person best equipped to provide education or training, whether a practicing school teacher or a professor, is allowed to provide it. Joseph Young, of the National Institute of Education, has spoken of his experience at the Harvard Graduate School of Education in the mid-sixties with U.S. Office of Education prospective teacher fellowships.[2] He reported that many of the young mathematics teachers who were recruited to the profession through this program were equal to or superior to the Harvard College mathematics faculty. His question is, "Who will provide inservice training for these gifted teachers?"

The other question, of course, is, "Will higher education use these gifted practitioners in advanced training of other teachers?" In the past, the education component of higher education--unlike law and medicine--has not been very imaginative in using the knowledge and skills possessed by what is called the practicing profession (elementary and secondary teachers and administrators) in either preservice or inservice training. Colleges and schools of education have much to learn from the other professional schools on campus.

---

[2] Joseph Young in a speech presented to the National Council of States on Inservice Education, New Orleans, La., November 18, 1976.

Another question is which teachers the university will teach. Currently, there is resistance in many of our better universities to allowing teachers into graduate programs in education and other fields. The issue of standards is quickly raised. These are, of course, standards that are exclusively the product of decision making inside of the university. Possibly, a more enlightened view is that the resources of the university should be available to anyone who bears the responsibility of teaching the young. What this suggests is that the university, particularly its college of education, has the responsibility to make its facilities available to any practicing teacher seeking to improve his or her teaching. The fact of practice within our schools, rather than one's undergraduate grade point average, should be the determining factor.

Along that same line, arbitrary entrance criteria of GRE scores and grade point averages should be downgraded in favor of a much more careful assessment of what the individual teacher's own performance is and careful planning of how it can be enhanced. What I am suggesting is that concern for entrance requirements be replaced by efforts to assess the strengths and weaknesses of teachers carefully, and then build their graduate professional programs with very clear exit criteria--exit criteria that will result in improved performance on the part of the individual teachers and improved results for children. The value of the approach rests on this concept of exit criteria and how rigorously it is adhered to. Without honest and careful application, the program employing these criteria could become a sham. Implicit, too, in this suggestion is replacing the current emphasis in universities of "our master's program in area" with individual programs of study and training built on the actual professional needs of teachers.

Clearly, to get to this point, the organized teaching profession and the universities will have to exist within a different relationship than is currently the case. The organized teaching profession needs to be an active planner in such efforts to redirect the efforts of higher education. It must actively support certain currents and movements within higher education and actively discourage others. Such changes will not happen without the strong support of teachers.

Service

The university's service role in inservice training is the aid provided by the university to a school district or a group of professionals within a school district. Although that aid might involve formal teaching (for example, an in-school graduate course on new theories of child development), it normally has a more applied character. The university is called on to assist in specific problem-solving activities, to consult on curricular questions, to help bring about a transition from one educational practice to another, or to study a particular phenomenon, such as the moral climate of a school.

The capacity to respond effectively to the pressing inservice needs of teachers is not only a crucial measure of the value of a university, but also represents a major source of inservice training for the university faculty. University faculty members in education need to be involved in on-site service in schools. Few university teacher educators can keep current in their area if they are not working with teachers and children in the field. Instead of being extra or after-hours work, service in schools should be built into the very fabric of the university educationists' work.

Members of the higher education community, therefore, should be called on to provide two kinds of services to the schools: (a) using their professional skills and expertise on problems which have been identified by the schools and teachers; and (b) actually teaching in schools, practicing skills and developing new ones in order to remain current in their area of expertise. We should be getting the support of the organized teaching profession to make these services a legitimate part of our work.

It is this area of service to teachers in schools which higher education finds most troubling and for which it has the fewest answers; and it is in this gray area that the greatest potential lies. Here, where the teacher is not a student in a professor's class or where the teacher and the class are not subjects of research, new forms of partnerships between professors and teachers will emerge. While service is an old ideal in higher education, it undoubtedly will be taking on new meanings for schools and colleges of education in the years ahead. However, we must first deal with some of the impediments to cooperation outlined later in this chapter.

Research

The area of research is where the unique contribution of the university comes into focus. However, the term "research" covers a multitude of functions. Some of these research functions can be carried on either by the staff of school districts, by private sector consulting firms, or by the university. Others, though, would appear to be uniquely the function of the university; for example, experimental efforts to increase learning through the use of certain chemicals.

The research function of the university can be ordered under three labels: practical problem solving, application of theory, and pure research. The first, practical problem solving, refers to that research function mentioned earlier in the discussion of service. The profession calls on the university to help solve a particular problem, such as diagnosing community attitudes toward citizenship education and designing a program to meet those expectations, or diagnosing the science teaching capabilities of a group of elementary school teachers and working with them to upgrade those skills.

A good deal of the research in colleges of education is the second kind, translating theory into practice. The education faculty member uses concepts or principles or theories from another discipline and attempts somehow to improve teaching and learning by finding an appropriate application of this new knowledge. The area of nonverbal communication offers an example of this application of theory. Professor Charles Galloway, on my own faculty, is attempting to provide teachers with a greater understanding and an increased sensitivity to the nonverbal communication of students and to their own nonverbal communication as teachers.

With the third kind, pure or basic research, we come in contact with the unique function of the university. The point needs to be made that relatively few of the many universities in this country can be said to contribute to pure research. This is particularly true in the field of education. Clark and Guba found that only a small percentage of the nation's nearly 1,400 institutions with education faculties are producing new knowledge about the educative process.[3] Certainly, many of the doctoral level institutions in education are making little or no contribution to what is known about schools or teaching.

The relationship between this pure research effort and the inservice needs of teachers is, however, crucial to any long-term sense of progress. Not only do we need new knowledge to gain control over human and environmental problems, we need knowledge to perform the functions of the school more effectively. We need to know more about how humans learn; how they process, store, and retrieve information. We need to know more about how creative energies of individuals can be tapped. We especially need to know how teachers learn and grow professionally. And, yes, we need to stand back and comment critically. However, the relationship between the research community and the practicing profession has not always been a close one.

Recently, some have urged that the education faculties in colleges and universities become the research arm of the teaching profession. At first blush this is an attractive idea, but on reflection it seems naive. The statement belongs to a currently popular class of invocations that refer to "the teaching profession" or "the profession" in almost reverential tones. These terms are supposed, it would seem, to excite fervor and numb all critical impulses. Such a response ignores the history of professionalism in this country, which can be read as the banding together of the givers of some service against the receivers of the service for their own personal or monetary interest.

From another vantage point, the university's traditional role in research would seem to be endangered if the research agenda were to be determined by the teaching profession. While it is proper for the teaching profession to have a say in how federal monies will be spent for research, others, including university researchers, should determine much of what that research agenda should be. It is important both for the integrity of the university and for the enterprise of education that the university retain its capacity to stand back and critically analyze issues related to education. It is the very function of the university to struggle with these questions. But if the function is not supported, it will soon stop. What then begins is a pernicious stagnation, quickly leading to an unchallenged orthodoxy that will surely have a deleterious effect on schooling in this country.

It would be hard to deny, however, that much of the research that has been produced by the higher education community has a certain "we gotcha" quality to it. Teachers and administrators are so conditioned to expect research reports to underscore their inadequacies and frailties that they shy away from reading research. Research as currently practiced has been, in effect, the enemy of the teacher. Where it is not critical of the teacher or the practice of the schools, it deals with issues and problems that have little to say about how schooling can be improved. The low representation of the teaching profession in the American Educational Research Association and its affairs is one indicator of this disaffection.

---

[3] David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba. "A Study of Teacher Education Institutions as Innovators, Knowledge Producers, and Change Agencies." Final Report. Bloomington: Indiana University School of Education, April 1977.

Although dealt with separately, these three roles of the university--teaching, service, and research--are not separate entities. Rather, they feed on one another, with research being enhanced by teaching, teaching by service, service by research, and so on.

IMPEDIMENTS TO THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Having stated that higher education has important and legitimate roles in inservice education, this paper should also quickly acknowledge that these roles are not necessarily being performed well. Many aspects of the relationship between universities and the teaching profession need to be improved if we are to have a solid basis for our graduate programs in education. The following considerations might be kept in mind as we work toward a smoother relationship.

First, we need to acknowledge that many institutions of higher education have very little or nothing to say to practicing teachers. In other universities, some units have a contribution that they make, or might make, available to teachers and other units do not. Recently, the superintendent of one of the largest cities in America angrily decried the fact that science teachers, particularly his physics teachers, could not get graduate-level coursework in their specialty from a nearby university. They could get methods courses in science, but no work that would build on their undergraduate training in the sciences.

We also need to acknowledge that elementary and secondary schools are part of one institutionalized system and universities are part of another. Public institutions of higher education are normally administered by boards of regents, which are quite different from the state departments of education to which public schools must be responsive. And being, in effect, paid out of different pockets means different styles, different goals, different award systems, and difficulties in communication.

The State of Ohio is an example: the State Department of Education has mandated a new set of state standards for teacher education. By and large, they are an improvement; they are also going to be extremely costly for colleges and universities to implement. However, the Board of Regents controls the pursestrings at the public institutions of higher education, and the Board has given no indication that it is ready to pay for these newly mandated training improvements in teacher education.

Yet another difficulty that inhibits the role of higher education is that inservice training results from the fact that, as Edward Ladd pointed out a few years ago, universities and schools have different cultures.[4] While professors and teachers can both be said to be educators, their habits, dispositions, and behavior are quite different. For instance, professors expect to be heavily involved in decision making. By and large, teachers are not involved in much decision making or policy formation. University faculty members exercise control over their own schedules and priorities; they control their own time. Teachers have to follow a much more structured schedule, one that they had little hand in developing. A professor's loyalty is usually to his or her discipline and rarely to the institution. Teachers have stronger bonds to their fellow teachers and their institutions. Professors tend to be more critical of the educational, political, and social status quo. Teachers tend to have more moderate and more clearly middle-class views. Such differences in culture not only inhibit smooth working relationships, they also increase the potential for hostility and conflict.

---

[4] Edward T. Ladd, in: Partnership in Teacher Education. E. Brooks Smith et al., eds. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Association for Student Teaching, 1968. pp. 96-104.

In addition to the variety of types of institutions that exist under the label of higher education, the differences within higher education institutions themselves also impinge on the way schools of education work with teachers in inservice education. Recently I spent three years as the Associate Dean for Program Development in a large state institution and experienced first-hand some of the orthodoxies and rigidities and rituals I have read about for years: the large and expensive machinery necessary to make a minor course change, the massive amount of faculty time and energy required for serious attention to a curricular question, the many levels of review required to make a program alteration. Fresh ideas and commitments were continually eroded by over-elaborate machinery for curricular review.

There are, however, some special problems the university has with the field of elementary and secondary education. For one thing, the university, particularly the graduate faculty, has difficulty dealing with a mass profession like the education profession. Second, the university's graduate faculty, composed of academics from many disciplines and fields, have trouble realizing that education has changed from its former lecture course format. The need to do education in a clinical setting, often involving hardware and employing new kinds of methodology, is difficult for them to grasp or appreciate.

Our cross-campus colleagues are also put off by the uneven knowledge base in education which is not well organized. We draw a little bit of sociology here, some social psychology there, a bit of anthropology from another place. Our colleagues are confused by education's odd blend of theory and practice, of concepts and skills, of empirically derived knowledge and folklore. The graduate faculty, who have a great deal to say about how the university as a whole and the College of Education in particular work with the schools, have difficulty realizing how a school system or a group of teachers could ask for a course in something like individualizing instruction in the social studies for elementary schools and hope to get a decision from the university within a few weeks.

And finally, the university's graduate faculty do not realize the mood of the teaching profession: the growing annoyance with what teachers perceive as self-serving rules and arbitrary standards, language requirements, or the requirement of admission to graduate school before being able to take a single course. Our university colleagues do not realize that teachers are tired of having to fit their schedules to the whims of professors, that teachers are tired of having no say about the content of the programs which are supposed to make them better teachers. They do not realize that teachers want some of the prerogatives of other professionals.

CONCLUSION

These, then are some reflections on the institutional context of our graduate programs in education. It is out of this general environment that our graduate programs must be redesigned or forged anew. As suggested at the beginning of this essay, institutions seek to perpetuate themselves; in other words, to serve their own ends rather than the group they were designed to help. This condition is complicated for institutions of higher education because they are no longer as isolated from the general society of which they are a part as they have been in years past. Today we appear to live in a very hopped-up, go-getter culture. Human initiative and competition have provided the fuel for our economic system. Formerly, higher education was divorced from this competitive, market-place culture. Schools, universities, libraries, and hospitals were given a special status and were not held as accountable as other institutions. They were considered essential for a good and healthy society, and people did not question their price.

People are questioning their price now. Parts of the education community have been invaded by a new set of concepts and a new vocabulary. One is more likely to hear educational administrators talking about cost-benefit ratios, new markets, human capital, and inputs and outputs than about individually guided instruction, core curricula, learning strategies, or the integration of knowledge. If our conversation is a guide, concern for quality is losing the race to concern for quantity. Being unable to measure quality, we are particularly vulnerable to this new markets concern for quantity. One might hazard the prediction, though, that this quantitative obsession will not serve us well in the long run. The graduate programs designed to the taste of the market place will ultimately do violence to higher education.

What I am suggesting, then, is that the only road open to us as we consider our graduate programs in education is the high road. To guide ourselves on this high road, we ought to plant two signs that would be clearly in sight. One should say, "Be Imaginative"; the other, "Be Courageous." The first should remind the higher education commmunity, both professors of education and their colleagues in the arts and sciences, to be open and flexible and creative in finding new ways to work with practitioners in the field in what is a new era with new conditions. The second is a call for us to be true to the fundamental mission of higher education, to be concerned with theory, with new ideas, and with old truths. It should act as a reminder not to do the merely expedient, currying favor with one group or another for some short-term gain. It should remind us to ask the searching and critical questions.

Finally, we must be imaginative and courageous in developing high-quality programs that make a difference, a positive difference in the way education professionals do their work. Ultimately, we will be judged by how well we assisted teachers to improve the lives of our children.

CONTRIBUTORS

Frederick B. Bunt
Dean, School of Education
Pace University
Pace Plaza
New York, New York

Richard J. Clark, Jr.
Assistant Dean
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

James M. Cooper
Professor of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

Carl J. Dolce
Dean, School of Education
North Carolina State
University
Raleigh, North Carolina

Robert L. Erdman
Dean, Graduate School of
Education
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Mario D. Fantini
Dean, School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Ira J. Gordon
Kenan Professor and Dean,
School of Education
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Daniel E. Griffiths
Dean, School of Education,
Health, Nursing, and the
Arts Professions
New York University
New York, New York

Joseph Lamberti
Director, Curriculum
Laboratory
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

John D. Mulhern
Dean, College of Education
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Dale Nitzschke
Dean, School of Education
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Vito Perrone
Dean, Center for Teaching
and Learning
University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota

Kevin Ryan
Professor of Education
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Wilford A. Weber
Professor of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ERIC

ERIC is a nationwide information system of the National Institute of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (research reports, articles, theoretical papers, tested methods, published or unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents in the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other education media.

THE CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by four professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (serves as fiscal agent); the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER); the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE); and the National Education Association (NEA). The Clearinghouse scope is the preparation of education personnel and, since March 1973, selected aspects of health education, physical education, and recreation education.

ACQUISITIONS

One of the main tasks of the Clearinghouse is the acquisition of documents within its scope. The Clearinghouse regularly receives publications from schools and professional associations around the country. But the majority of documents must come unsolicited, from researchers, teachers, and project directors who have produced or are producing materials within these subject areas. All documents sent to the Clearinghouse are evaluated by subject experts. If they meet Clearinghouse selection criteria, they are abstracted and indexed for announcement in the abstract journal, Resources in Education (RIE). The majority of RIE documents are then made available for study on microfiche at more than 600 locations (universities, public libraries, professional associations, government agencies) that have an ERIC microfiche collection. Documents can usually be purchased in microfiche or "hardcopy" (xerographic reproduction) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Va. 22210.